DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 943 RC 005 359

AUTHOR Patella, Victoria Morrow
TITLE A Study of the Validity of Language Usage as an Indicator of Ethnic Identification.
PUB DATE May 71
NOTE 147p.; Master's thesis submitted to Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Aspiration, *Ethnic Studies, Family Background, Family Life, Identification (Psychological), *Language Usage, Masters Theses, *Mexican Americans, Mobility, Research Needs, Residential Patterns, Rural Urban Differences, Sex Differences, *Sociocultural Patterns, *Spanish

ABSTRACT

In determining whether Spanish usage is a valid indicator of ethnic identification, 669 Texas high school sophomores (3 Negroes, 70 Anglos, and 596 Mexican Americans) were interviewed. Mexican American respondents were then isolated on the basis of response to 4 questions, and their responses regarding family were grouped under 2 headings: (1) Characteristics of Family of Orientation and (2) Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation. Data were analyzed using the analysis of variance F-test, with controlled variables being sex, place of residence (city, town, country-nonfarm, and farm), and residence on/not on the Mexican Border. Language usage as an indicator of ethnic identification was concluded to be invalid by this study, but "the theoretical significance of this fact must be explored." On the basis of this, the author discounted language usage as a criterion to judge an individual's success index, feeling and thinking index, and job performance index. It was noted that, in educating the Mexican American, forced acculturation should be discouraged while encouraging bilingual education. (A related document is ED 023 512.) (MJB)

ED051943

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF THE VALIDITY OF LANGUAGE USAGE AS AN INDICATOR OF ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

A Thesis

by

VICTORIA MORROW PATELLA

Submitted to the Graduate College of
Texas A&M University in
partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

May 1971

Major Subject: Sociology

ED005359

A STUDY OF THE VALIDITY OF LANGUAGE USAGE AS AN INDICATOR OF ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

A Thesis

by

VICTORIA MORROW PATELLA

Approved as to style and content by:

_____

(Chairman of Committee)

_____

(Head of Department)

_____ _____

(Member) (Member)

May 1971

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

May I here express my enormous gratitude to the following individuals:

Dr. William P. Kuvlesky, Professor of Sociology, for his careful, relentless, and invaluable critical evaluation of the manuscript from its status as a one-page topic of inquiry to its completion;

Dr. Bardin H. Nelson, Professor of Sociology, and Dr. W. B. Smith, Professor of Statistics, for serving on my committee;

Kathy Thomas, Research Associate, for her swift and sure answer to numerous local and long-distance pleas for help with the computer analysis; Mr. Brad Lisenbe, Mr. Peter Liu, and Mr. Edward Lindstrom for their programing.

Janet Tedford, for typing and help in so many ways, and the other departmental secretaries for their typing of the rough drafts;

The beautiful graduate students of Room 209, for the countless and endless dialogues, arguments, and scraps concerning everything from Parsons to Peanuts;

and most of all to Michael, for being a groovy husband, and for not laughing at the infant science or the infant scientist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Implications of the Research	3
Source of Data	5
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
CHAPTER III. FRAMEWORK FOR STUDY	19
CHAPTER IV. METHODOLOGY	29
Data Collection	29
Indicators and Measurements	31
Language Usage	31
Family	41
Characteristics of Family of Orientation	42
Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation	47
Controls	49
Statistical Analysis	56
CHAPTER V. RESULTS	57
Characteristics of Family of Orientation	58
Birthplace of Parents	58
Major Money Earner	59
Employment of the Father	59
Employment of the Mother	59
Marital Status of Parents	60
Rela ive Education of Parents	61
Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation	62

Page

Relative Importance of Family 62
Desire to Marry 62
Desire of Males for Wife to Work 62
Desire of Females to Work after Marriage 63
Ideal Family Size 63
Summary 71

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 74

Conclusions 74
Implications 87
Theory 87
Research 90
Methodology 92
Social Policy 93

BIBLIOGRAPHY 98

APPENDICES 104

Indicators 104
Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Index on Tentative Controls 111
Frequency Distributions of Responses to Each of the Main Items 116
Complete Analyses of Variance for Main Items 127

VITA 137

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29b, Language Used With Parents, and 29c, Language Used With Close Friends in Neighborhood	38
2	Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29b, Language Used With Parents, and 29d, Language Used With Close Friends Outside Class	39
3	Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29c, Language Used With Close Friends in Neighborhood, and 29d, Language Used With Friends Outside Class	40
4	Numbers of Responsdents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 30, Radio Programs Listened to, and 31, Magazines and Newspapers Read	40
5	Riedwyl Goodness of Fit Test: Frequency Distribution for Index by Sex	52
6	Analysis of Variance With Respect to Index of Language Usage	54
7	Mean Index by Sex, Place of Residence, and Border/Non-Border Residence	55
8	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Birthplace of Parents	65
9	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Major Money Earner	66
10	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage for Mexican American Males and Females with Respect to Employment of Father	66

Table		Page
11	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Mother	67
12	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females with Respect to Marital Status of Parents (where both are alive)	67
13	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Education of Parents	68
14	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Importance of Family	68
15	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Desire to Marry.	69
16	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males With Respect to Desire for Wife to Work	69
17	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Females With Respect to Desire to Work After Marriage . . .	70
18	Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Ideal Family Size	70
19	Summary of Results	72
20	Percentage Distribution for Index by Sex: Total Column Indicates What Percent of all R's had Each Index, and Sex Columns Indicate for Each Index, What the Sex Ratio was	111
21	Frequency Distribution for Index by Border/ Non-Border Residence	112

Table		Page
22	Percentage Distribution for Index by Border/ Non-Border Residence: Indicates for Each Index Value What Percentage of Those R's Were Border or Non-Border. (Total column has same content as in Table 20.) Parenthetical Value Indicates What Percentage of all Respondents Classified Border or Non-Border had Each Index	113
23	Frequency Distribution for Index by Location	114
24	Percentage Distribution for Index by Location: Indicates for Each Index Value What Percentage of Those R's Were City, Town, Country, or Farm Residents. (Total column has same content as in Table 20.) Parenthetical Value Indicates What Percent of all Respondents Classified Either City, Town, Country, or Farm Had Each Index	115
25	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Birthplace of Parents of Mexican American Males and Females	116
26	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Major Money Earner in Family of Mexican American Males and Females	117
27	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Employment of the Father of Mexican American Males and Females	118
28	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Employment of the Mother of Mexican American Males and Females	119
29	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Marital Status of Parents of Mexican American Males and Females	120
30	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Relative Education of Parents of Mexican American Males and Females	131

Table		Page
31	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Relative Importance of Family for Mexican American Males and Females	122
32	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Desire to Marry of Mexican American Males and Females	123
33	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Desire of Mexican American Males for Wife to Work	124
34	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Desire of Mexican American Females to Work After Marriage	125
35	Frequency Distribution of Responses: Ideal Family Size	126
8a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Birthplace of Parents	127
9a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Major Money Earner	128
10a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Father	129
11a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Mother	130
12a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Marital Status of Parents	131
13a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Education of Parents	132

Table		Page
14a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Importance of Family	133
15a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Desire to Marry	134
16a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males With Respect to Desire for Wife to Work	135
17a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Females With Respect to Desire to Work After Marriage	135
18a	Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Ideal Family Size	136

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this thesis is to examine the validity of Spanish language usage as an indicator of identification with the Mexican American subculture. This problem arose from the unexpected outcome of a study done by Kuvlesky and Patella (1970) dealing with intergenerational mobility aspirations of Mexican American youth. The hypothesis of the researchers, which is presented below, was founded upon two basic assumptions: first, that the Mexican American subculture has a particularistic-ascriptive type value pattern, and second, that mother tongue usage is a valid indicator of ethnic identification. The first assumption rests upon Parsons' assertion that the Mexican-American subculture is in fact characteristic of the particularistic-ascriptive type, an assertion which is very strongly supported by the descriptive literature dealing with this subculture. The second assumption is one very widely held by sociological and linguistic investigators and only rarely

---

The pattern for format and style of this thesis is the American Sociological Review.

questioned, though its universal applicability has been disproven in several cases.

Drawing upon these two assumptions, Kuvlesky and Patella hypothesized that young Mexican Americans who desired intergenerational mobility were rejecting to some extent their ascriptive mother culture; thus, theoretically, they would be less strongly identified with the ethnic subculture than those who did not desire intergenerational mobility. The measure of the degree of an individual's identification with the subculture was an index of his use of the Spanish language as opposed to English: the higher an individual's index, the more Spanish he used, and the more strongly he was considered to be identified with the subculture. Unexpectedly, the hypothesis was not supported by the data; there did not seem to be an inverse relation between Spanish language usage and desire for intergenerational mobility.

As the two assumptions underlying the hypothesis are examined, the second, concerning the validity of language usage as a measure of ethnic identification, seems the most questionable and the most likely as a basis for the unsupported hypothesis. The objective of this thesis, then, is to evaluate this second assumption.

This will be done by determining the correlation of Spanish language usage, a presumed indicator of ethnicity, with other presumed indicators of ethnicity, using data from the same subjects as those used in the Kuvlesky and Patella study. More specifically, the basic hypothesis under test is the following: Relative use of the Spanish language versus the English language is directly correlated with identification with the ethnic subculture.

Implications of the Research

This investigation has relevance for sociolinguistic theory in that it evaluates a widely held assumption of sociologists and sociolinguists concerning the relation of language and culture. The relation of this study to prior research is described above. The study has methodological significance as well in that an often used measure of ethnicity, namely language usage, is being challenged. As the particular bias of this researcher dictates that the practical value and implications of any research should be explored, some possible implications of this study are suggested below. As conclusions are drawn from the study, more specific implications and recommendations are brought out.

The plight of Mexican Americans as members of a minority group in this society is finally beginning to be realized by the society at large. It is to be hoped that any research dealing with this subculture would be at least partially aimed at ameliorating the situation of Mexican Americans in some way. The aim of this research, in addition to dealing with an important theoretical question, is to discover something about how Mexican American youth might be better dealt with in our educational system than they generally are at present. For example, educators make the same assumption as do researchers concerning language usage; for them, if a child speaks his mother tongue in an English-speaking environment, he is totally rejecting the dominant American culture. Typically, the educator's reaction to this supposed rejection is either to punish the child in an attempt to change his behavior, or to "give up" on him, assuming he cannot be educated, even in the Spanish language itself. An important step to be taken in the amelioration of this situation which is supremely unfair to the young people involved, is to determine whether or not preference of the Spanish language implies rejection of the dominant culture in favor of the subculture. In this study, an attempt will be made to draw

some conclusions concerning this point. Whatever the outcome, there will be important implications for the behavior of educators. If in fact, a strong preference for Spanish indicates rejection of the dominant culture, educators must be persuaded then to interest Mexican American students and involve them in the dominant culture in meaningful ways, while still allowing them their subcultural identification, rather than punishing them for non-conformity. If in fact use of Spanish by students co-exists with assimilation into the dominant culture, strong impetus might be provided for bilingual education programs. In either case, students should be allowed to learn appreciation of their culture. As conclusions and implications are drawn from the results of this study, suggestions will be made concerning how this should be done.

Source of Data[1]

The data for this thesis were collected in the spring of 1967 in two southwest Texas counties - Dimmit and Maverick - and two South Texas counties - Starr and Zapata. The subjects were sophomores in the seven high schools of these counties.

These counties were purposely selected for the

larger research project in that the populations were predominantly Mexican American, economically depressed and predominantly rural and/or non-metropolitan. They are especially appropriate for this study in that they are on or near the Mexican border. It should be remarked that the subject of interest here could have been investigated in any of various areas of the United States where there is a substantial Mexican American population: Southern California, New Mexico, Arizona, or Colorado. In any case, the proximity to the border provides a theoretically ideal situation for this study of a bilingual group in that subjects should have opportunity for a high degree of contact with both the English and Spanish languages there, as well as with both of the two cultures. Thus an individual theoretically could identify with either culture with equal ease.

There is a great deal of variability among the seven schools in terms of size, curricula offerred, nature of the students, and many other characteristics. The youth interviewed for this study comprised nine-tenths of those enrolled in the seven schools at the time. High school sophomores were used in this study because sophmores had been used in other related studies, in order to

make this data as comparable as possible.

---

[1]This thesis utilizes data from and contributes to a larger regional project entitled "Human Resource Development and Mobility in the Rural South." As stated in a prior thesis contributing to this project (Juarez, 1968:20), this study is sponsored by the Southern Regional Project H-2611, "under the auspices of . . . The Cooperative State Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. The general objective of the overall project is to determine the characteristics of and factors involved in the developmental sequences and decision-making processes of people in the rural South during selected stages of the life cycle." Information concerning the source of the data was drawn from the thesis of David W. Wright, Jr. (1968).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Sociolinguistic and sociological theorists and researchers have long assumed that language usage patterns of bilingual groups of people directly reflect people's relative involvement with the ethnic mother culture and the second culture. Joshua Fishman (1966:25), in his comprehensive theoretical and empirical study of language loyalty of various ethnic groups in the United States, totally equates maintenance of the mother tongue with identification with the ethnic subculture. According to Kroeber (1964:vii),

> Language is easily the most nearly autonomous, self-consistent, and self-contained unit which is discernible within the totality of culture. Why this is - why perhaps it had to be - is something that we do not understand with clarity or conviction; and I shall therefore not try even to suggest an explanation, but accept the fact as something that students of language and students of culture both posit as a starting point, explicity or implicitly.

Christian and Christian (1966:300) in a theoretical analysis of the interrelation of language and culture state that these two together "form the basic orientation toward reality of any given person or group of persons." They define the concepts included in this statement in the following way:

> Reality - the total structure of that which is perceived and regarded as objectively valid by any definable social group; Language - a system of symbols with a coherent set of rules of reference and transformation rules by means of which a social group finds it possible to communicate; Culture - a system of meanings, methods, and values which develops from the common frame of reference of a social group, and which remains relatively constant while the composition of the group changes.

The authors present a schema of interaction of these three elements which depicts reality as creating language and culture, and in turn being created by them. Likewise, language and culture create, and are created by, each other. Leach (1966:32) describes language as one of the main indices of social cohesion. Hoijer (1964:456) states that "the interrelation of language and other aspects of culture is so close that no part of the culture of a particular group can properly be studied without reference to the linguistic symbols in use."

Likewise, empirical investigators have assumed that language usage is an indicator of ethnic identification. Lambert (1966:483), in a study of French bilinguals in Canada and two areas of the United States, indicates that an individual's dominant language indicates that culture with which he most strongly identifies. For example, he states that "a very strong desire for a rejuvenation of French culture in Louisiana can retard bilingualism;"

that is, if people strongly identify with the French subculture, they will be disinclined to speak English. Celia Heller (1961:31), in discussing the Mexican American subculture, makes the following remark: "It has been observed that from the Anglo point of view the wide use of Spanish is the primary symbol of the 'foreignness' of the Mexican Americans, but from the latters' viewpoint, it is the primary symbol of La Raza." Hayden (1966) takes a unique approach to the study of the preservation of the ethnic group, in that he collects data concerning not only the ethnic mother tongue as an indicator of ethnicity, but also observance of ethnic customs and traditions, and knowledge of cultural achievements and ideas. However, as do nearly all other empiricists treating language usage as an indicator of ethnicity, Hayden accepts without question its validity as such an indicator. Kloss (1966:212), in his discussion of German-American language maintenance efforts, uses "ethnicity" and "German-language maintenance" interchangeably.

However, the assumption that maintenance of the mother tongue reflects higher involvement with the mother culture than with the second culture, though widely accepted, has also been challenged occasionally; moreover, there is evidence to indicate that the assumption

is invalid in many cases. Simon Herman (1961), for example, in his presentation of a theoretical framework for analysis of the social psychology of language choice, treats the above mentioned assumption as an unanswered question. His major concern is with the development of a framework for study of determinants of language choice in situations where either of two languages could serve as the medium of communication, but in his introductory remarks he makes the following statement: "If group identifications were, indeed, found to play a significant part (in language choice), it would permit an approach from the opposite angle: the choice of language could be used as a behavioural index to group preferences and to the direction of social adjustment - particularly among immigrants and other newcomers in a society." Thus Herman does not assume, as do so many others, that given the state of the knowledge on the subject of language usage and ethnic identification, language choice can already be used as a behavioral index, but rather that it <u>might</u> at some future time be so used, were it validated as such an index. Kloss (1962:212), though he equates mother tongue usage and ethnicity in general, also questions the long-held assumption of their identity by pointing out a reason why they might in fact not go hand

in hand: "A high degree of ethnic pride and self-reliance may, at first glance, seem definitely favorable to language maintenance. Actually, these characteristics may hasten the process of assimilation since they may lead to the view that group life can be maintained without linguistic continuity." Johnston (1966:449), in a study of Polish post-war immigrants in Australia, made the following finding: "Many older Polish immigrants in Australia identified strongly with English, although they hardly spoke or understood it several years after their settlement. On the other hand many young immigrants spoke English faultlessly and yet identified strongly with Polish although they spoke it very poorly."

Fishman (1966:441), who like Kloss and others, tends to identify mother tongue maintenance with ethnicity, does question the assumption of their correlation:

> A determination of the circumstances under which language and non-language behaviors change concurrently, consecutively, or independently constitutes one of the major intellectual challenges currently facing this field of inquiry . . . Whether (or when) language habits change more or less quickly than others, whether (or when) language loyalties are more or less powerful than others, indeed, whether (or when) men can live in a supraethnic tomorrow without strong links (linguistic and non-linguistic) to their ethnic yesterday and today - these are questions to which there are currently no definitive answers. (1966:453)

Also he points out (1966:442) that maintenance of the mother tongue and maintenance of the traditional culture have not always gone hand in hand: "It appears that group loyalty can be similarly (if not more) ubiquitous, continuing both with and without language maintenance." And Fishman cites the following group of empirical studies in order to back up this remark (1966:442); these studies all question the assumption that "language maintenance is a function of intactness of group membership or group loyalty as nationalism." Weinreich (1953:100) states that "the Raetoromans, like the Italian Swiss, cultivate the fullest possible loyalty to their language, without aspiring to such nationalistic goals as political independence." Also, the "Yiddishist movement in Eastern Europe before and after World War I similarly concentrated on a language program rather than on political organization" (Weinreich, 1953:100). Fishman himself found (Fishman and Nahirny, 1964) that "second and third generation Americans frequently maintain 'cultural bilingualism' after ethnic group loyalty disappears at any functional level." On the other hand, Hohenthal and McCorkle (1955:288-300) in their study of the Guayqueries, an aboriginal group in Venezuela, found that these people "preserved their groupness by preserving their property

relations while giving up their language and religion." Likewise Orans (1950:108-114) points out that "the lower caste groups in India pursue Sanskritization (emulation) rather than solidarity as a means of intact group mobility." Kuhn (1934) indicates that "many auslandsdeutsche maintained their self-identification as Germans in the midst of Polish or Ukrainian majorities, long after completely giving up their German mother tongue." Bronsnahan (1963:54-65) and Spencer (1963) both point out that "language loyalty is low in many newly developing and highly nationalistic African states." The aristocracy in Czarist Russia provides a final example demonstrating that a high correlation between language usage and ethnicity does not have to exist. They, and elites of several other countries at various times, "preferred a language other than their national vernacular without changing their national identity or loyalty" (Fishman, 1966:442).

Thus it is apparent that the presumed correlation which so many theorists and researchers have relied upon is far from a necessary one, and an understanding of just how mother tongue usage is related to other indicators of ethnicity cannot be had without specific empirical study of this correlation for specific ethnic groups and their

particular situation. The assumed correlation comes under even more serious question if the complex of factors which affect the language choice of an individual at a given moment (and ultimately his language usage patterns) are considered.

The universe of variables which may affect language usage as described by sociolinguistic theorists and researchers is a very large one. An attempt will be made here to illustrate the number and variety of these variables, without exhausting all of the known possibilities.

Ervin-Tripp suggests that language choice varies with the content of the communication (1968:302). Rubin points out three main types of variables influencing language choice in a bilingual situation: 1) the relationship between the persons involved in the conversation, i.e. their intimacy, their status, their sex; 2) the attributes of the members of the conversation, i.e., class level, place of origin; 3) the aspects of the situation, i.e., formality vs. informality, public vs. private, location of the conversation, and the seriousness of the situation (1968:514-515). Besides these main types, she also suggests several other variables: the attitude of the school toward use of each of the two

languages, the individual's own estimate of his linguistic proficiency, the trend toward bilingualism in the particular community, and which of the two languages was acquired first (1968:525-527).

Rübel, on the basis of his participant observation study of a community in South Texas with a high proportion of Mexican Americans, indicates that an individual's awareness of the advantage with which skill in a particular language grants him affects his rate of use of it (1966:11). Hymes feels that a subgroup's feeling that their own language is inferior, or is treated as though it were, affects their use of it (1968:129). Likewise, Lambert shows that attitudes of a subgroup toward the dominant group and its language affect not only their choice of one language or the other, but even their ability to learn the second language (1968:482). Thus attitudes toward each of the two cultures involved in a bilingual situation will affect the language choice of the individuals involved. Kuhn deals with the rate of shift from dominance of one language to dominance of another in bilingual areas, and proposes several variables which influence the stages of this shift: 1) the original legitimization and concentration of the settlement of the subcultural group; 2) the relative "cultural development

of settlers and their hosts;" and 3) the period of the settlement and its age (1934).

Fishman emphasizes the importance of the "domain" in the language choice of an individual, and defines the term in the following way: "a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships and interaction between communicators and locales of communication in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a culture in such a way that individual behavior and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other." Numerous other authors as well focus on domains as critical in language choice (Schmidt-Rohr, 1933; Mackey, 1956, Barker, 1945:228-234; Barber, 1952; Bronsnahan, 1963:54-65).

Weinreich points out that opportunity to use the two languages is also important; "geographic obstacles or facilitations" as well as other aspects of opportunity have a strong influence upon language usage (1953). Haugen brings out the role of education in language choice (1954:116-122). Mackey specifies "'variables' that may presumably modify language use: duration of contact, frequency of contact and 'pressures' of contact derived from 'economic, administrative, cultural,

political, military, historical, religious or demographic sources'" (1956:8).

In summary, then, the number and variety of variables which may affect language usage is very great.

CHAPTER III

FRAMEWORK FOR STUDY

This thesis is founded upon the widely held assumption that maintenance of the mother tongue is, in fact, a valid indicator of ethnicity, and the implications of this assumption will be examined here. It is important, then, to consider those specific aspects of culture which might theoretically be expected to correlate with maintenance of the mother tongue if the above assumption is valid. The objective of this research is first to examine those aspects of one bilingual subculture which differentiate it from the dominant culture, and second to discover which of those aspects, if any, are correlated with greater use of the mother tongue than of the second tongue, and which are not. Those characteristics of the Mexican American subculture which make it distinct from the Anglo culture and which could, thus, be considered indicators of identification with the ethnic subculture, have been treated at length in the literature.

Parsons points out this subculture as an example of the particularistic-ascriptive value pattern, in contrast with United States culture as a whole, which is characteristic of the universalistic-achievement value

pattern (1951:199). Parsons states that the former type pattern is exemplified by a "tendency for the organization of the social structure to crystallize about the relational reference points, notably those of kinship and local community" (1951:198). Thus it would be logical to examine these two areas, kinship relations and community, for characteristics of the subculture which differentiate it from the dominant culture. Christian and Christian propose "the strict division of social roles" and religious affiliation with the Catholic church as well as family (1966:302). Gonzalez also suggests the role of the community, describing it as "the second primary social unit to which Hispanos become attached," the first being the family (1969:63). Included here as well might be participation in ethnic organizations and ethnic celebrations. Due to the limitations of the data, this study focusses on family.

The universe of family characteristics which might be examined is broad; an attempt will be made here to describe the Mexican American family in ideal typical terms, since the ultimate purpose will be to discuss various degrees of deviation from an ideal type. To begin with, the source of the culture, and a prime force in its maintenance is Mexico: "Much of the traditional

Hispano culture may be changed or even swept away within a generation but for the imponderable factor of contacts with Mexico" (Edmonson, 1957:52). Gonzales concurs: "The proximity to Mexico has facilitated a continual contact which has served to maintain and even strengthen the Latin culture of the Southwest" (1967:29). In addition to being strongly influenced by Mexico, the Mexican American subculture, Parsons asserts, is characteristic of the particularistic-ascriptive type value pattern (1951:200). He describes cultures having this value pattern in the following way:

> They tend to be traditionalistic for two reasons: first that there is no incentive to disturb tradition; on the contrary a strong vested interest in its stability; second that there is a high elaboration of expressive symoblism which is in fact a system of conventions. It can only serve this function if the symbolic meanings are highly stablized. Morality, therefore, tends to be focussed on the traditional acceptance of received standards and arrangements" (1951:199).

Literature concerning the Mexican American family emphasizes this traditionalism. The tie of the individual to his family is described as being very strong, such that it "overshadows all other bonds" (Rubel, 1966:55). Even after marriage young people have an exceptionally strong tendency to stay close to their families (Rubel, 1966:57-58). Research concerning social interaction patterns of

Mexican Americans in rural and urban New Mexico indicates that "most social intercourse occurs among relatives" (Gonzalez, 1969:60). The highest rate of interaction of all is found between persons related not only biologically, but also by a ritual kinship tie (Gonsalez, 1969: 63). The system of ritual kinship, known as compadrazgo (co-parentship), according to various authors continues to flourish among Mexican Americans (Rubel, 1966:83; Heller, 1966:34). This is a system whereby a father asks a close friend to act as godparent to his child, and thus initiates a strong tie between his family and his friend.

Within the family, elders are treated with great respect and submission (Rubel, 1966:59). In fact, "the respect for one's elders is a major organizing principle of the Mexican American family..coupled with the principle of male dominance." An informant described the situation to Rubel in this way: "In la raza the older order the younger, and men the women." The Mexican father is described as the center of authority and responsibility for the family as a whole (Christian and Crhistian, 1966: 302). He is not only the breadwinner, but also "fiscal y juez" (prosecuting attorney and judge) and policeman as well. No suitor must confront him, and his children would not dare to smoke or drink in front of him (Rubel,

1966:61-62). This role description does not extend to both parents:

> The division of labor between the sexes is sharply defined. It is not considered proper for women to work outside the home or for men to engage in household activities...The Mexican woman traditionally has no other concept of her role or function than as a housekeeper with children (Christian and Christian, 1966:302). Since she rarely uses effective methods of birth control, it is expected that she will bear children regularly, leaving no time for work outside the home even were it otherwise permissible (1966: 305).

Training of children reflects this sexual difference involving great freedom for men and extreme restriction for women (Heller, 1966:36). As Tuck describes child rearing practices, "The girl is trained for the home, the boy for the world" (1946:124). Burma states that "girls are closely supervised and taught that their place is in the home" (1954:11).

Relations between parents and children are also sexually differentiated. There is a great closeness between mothers and daughters, one which is maintained even after marriage of the daughter. Between fathers and sons, however, this closeness does not exist, and the relationship is marked, rather, by distance (Rubel, 1966:67-68). Sisters, like mothers and daughters, also maintain very strong and intimate relations (Rubel, 1966:69).

Marriage is contracted by means of a complex pattern of rituals which is highly distinctive of the subculture. Dating procedures do not include the "serial dating" pattern common in the dominant culture, and chaperoning of young girls continues to exist (Rubel, 1966:76,79). Marriages between Mexican Americans and persons who are not members of the subculture exist, but are not fully approved of; Gonzalez describes the world view of the subculture as one which disapproves of exogamy and calls "the product of such marriages 'coyote'" (Gonzalez, 1969: 166). Gonzalez asserts that the practice of divorce is completely contrary to traditional beliefs and behaviors, and indicates that where it exists, a breakdown in traditional attitudes proscribing divorce has occurred (such as might obtain as urbanization occurs) (1969:129). The source of these beliefs is the Catholic church, which continues to be by far the predominant religion of the subculture, and to exert a powerful influence on the family (Heller, 1966:17-19). The Mexican American is typically traditionalistic in his religion as in other realms of his life, and thus the church's proscription of use of birth control measures is followed carefully and families tend to be large.

Education, an outstanding value of the dominant

culture, is not stressed in the subculture. There is relatively little encouragement of children to acquire education; it is seen as threatening to the father-son relationship and thus is feared. Also parents fear the frustration it may bring their children (Heller, 1966: 39-40). Education for girls is recommended even less than for boys, an attitude which seems to be based on the belief that if a woman knows more than her husband, she may boss him or make him feel inferior (Rubel, 1966:68).

Due to the limitations of the data, this study examines only a few of these family characteristics as indicators of identification with the subculture. More specifically, ethnicity is measured by means of the degree to which the characteristics of the family are consistent with, or different from, the above description of the Mexican American family. Two classes of family attributes are available in the data, and are utilized here: 1) Characteristics of the family of orientation; the assumption is that an individual from a more typical Mexican American family would be more strongly identified with the subculture than an individual from a less typical Mexican American family, and in accordance

with the hypothesis being tested here, the former individual would have a stronger preference for Spanish (as measured by the index of language usage) than the latter type individual; and 2) Aspirations for the future family of procreation; the assumption here is that an individual who aspires to have a family of his own which is similar to the typical Mexican American family is more strongly identified with the subculture than an individual who aspires to have a family of his own which is not similar to the typical Mexican American family; in accordance with the hypothesis under test, the former individual would have a stronger preference for Spanish than the latter.

The universe of characteristics of family of orientation and aspirations for future family of procreation is as varied as the family description above. Data could fruitfully be gathered and ethnic identification measured for both of the above two classes by means of information concerning attitudes and practices in all of the following areas:

1) Contact with Mexico
2) Strength of the tie to the family and its importance relative to other goals and involvements (friendships, occupation,

education, money, etc.)

3) Social interaction patterns, their restriction to family

4) Nuclearity or extendedness of family

5) Compadrazgo

6) Relations between young and old

7) Male dominance over females

8) Role of the father and of the mother

9) Working of women outside the home

10) Birth Control and family size

11) Child rearing

12) Parent-child relations

13) Sibling relations

14) Contracting of marriage

15) Dating procedures

16) Exogamy

17) Divorce

18) Education

The data available for this study allow examination of the following areas of characteristics of family of orientation and aspirations for future family of procreation:

1) Family of orientation

a) Contact with Mexico

b) Roles of the parents and working of women outside the home

c) Divorce

d) Education

2. Family of procreation

a) Importance of family relative to other goals and involvements

b) Desire to marry - ideal family size

c) Working of women outside the home

While the data is limiting, it does, nonetheless, provide a varied sampling of the important areas of family of orientation; it is, however, weak concerning family of procreation. Even so, the aspects of family of procreation which are tapped are key ones, which should have strong implications for other aspects not included.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection[2]

The schedule utilized in this study was pretested during the summer of 1965 on selected Negro and white male and female high school students in Bryan and College Station, Texas. An 18-page revised schedule was administered to high school students in selected East Texas counties, and in two other Southern states in the spring of 1966. The schedule was then revised to the final 12-page form employed in the collection of data for the study of which this thesis is a part.

The data collection took place in May of 1967, and was performed by means of group interviews conducted by trained graduate students in the selected schools. The interviewers were introduced to the subjects as representatives of Texas A&M University who were studying youth in Texas. One of the interviewers read each question aloud as the respondents answered on the questionnaire. Both the respondents and the school officials

---

[2]Information concerning the data collection is drawn from the thesis of David W. Wright, Jr. (1968).

involved were informed beforehand that all responses would be confidential: names and addresses of the respondents were collected only for the use of the researchers. Administration of the questionnaire took from 35 to 70 minutes, with the pace being altered as appropriate for each group of interviewees.

Interviews were administered only to students present on the scheduled day; this group included 669 of the 765 sophomores enrolled in the study schools. No attempt was made to contact those not present. Of these only the 596 Mexican American respondents will be used, 290 males and 306 females.[3] The remaining group of 73 students included 3 Negroes and 70 Anglos (neither Negro or Mexican American).

---

[3]In order to be certain of isolating all Mexican American respondents from the group of 669, the responses to four different questions were utilized, rather than just a single indicator. These were his name (then compared to the Census Bureau list of Spanish surnames), his indication of ancestry as described above, the language he uses in various situations, and the birth place of his parents (Wright, 1968: 43-44). This method, just as any other, cannot assure complete accuracy.

Indicators and Measurements

Language Usage

The literature on the subject of language usage patterns described previously makes it clear that many sources of variance and different domains of language behavior must be examined if patterns are to be studied and described. Joshua Fishman provides an outstanding integration of much of the literature on this subject and presents the following sources of variance: 1) medium - variability must be expected to exist between speaking, reading, and writing; 2) role - usage will vary according to whether language is utilized for inner communication (ego is both source and target), for comprehension (decoding; ego is the target, alter is the source), or for production (encoding; ego is the source, alter is the target); 3) situation - variation in language usage occurs as the situation shifts from formal to informal to intimate (Fishman, 1966:427). The domains of language behavior which Fishman proposes likewise encompass those described by others. He suggests the following domains: 1) family; 2) neighborhood, differentiated into "friends" and "acquaintances"; 3) mass media; 4) ethnic organizations; and 5) occupation (Fishman, 1966: 437). For Fishman's tabular presentation

of his schema, see Figure I. This schema is not exhaustive; a major lack to be pointed out, for example, is Ervin-Tripp's suggested variable - the content of the communication.

However, this schema nevertheless provides a useful summarization of the universe available to the researcher attempting to tap language usage patterns and describe them systematically. The indicators of language usage utilized in this study may now be examined within this larger framework, and evaluated with respect to the efficiency and thoroughness with which they may be expected to tap the universe. Respondents were asked the following questions (See Appendix for items exactly as presented):

1. (a) Do you speak Spanish?

   1 Yes 2 No

   (b) What language do you usually use when speaking with your parents?

   1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same amount of both

   (c) What language do you usually use when talking with your close friends in your neighborhood?

   1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same amount of both

FIGURE I

Fishman's Schema of Domains, Sources of Variance, and Media of Language Usage.

Media	Role	Situation	Family	Neighborhood: Friends	Neighborhood: Acquaints.	Mass Med.	Ethnic Orgs.	Occup.
Speak.	Inner	Formal						
		Informal						
		Intimate						
	Comp.	Formal	X	X		X		X
		Informal	X	X		X		X
		Intimate	X	X		X		X
	Prod.	Formal	X	X				X
		Informal	X	X				X
		Intimate	X	X				X
Read.	Comp.	Formal				X		
		Informal				X		
		Intimate				X		
	Prod.	Formal						
		Informal						
		Intimate						
Writ.	Prod.	Formal						
		Informal						
		Intimate						

(d) What language do you usually use when speaking with your close school friends outside of class?

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same amount of both

2. How many of the radio programs you listen to are broadcast in Spanish?

1 None 2 Some 3 More-than-half 4 All

3. How many of the magazines and newspapers which you read are in Spanish?

1 None 2 Some 3 More-than-half 4 All

If Fishman's schema is accepted as including the principal life domains of language behavior and as being a useful description of the media of communication and the roles of language, then usage patterns may be discussed in terms of 108 medium versus role versus situation versus domain cells, as they are presented in Fishman's table. Those cells which could be filled by the data collected in this study are indicated in the table. As this study did not differentiate among situations, the 24 individual cells which are indicated in the table as being filled by the data actually comprise only 8 cells (or 8 blocks of 3 cells each). Thus there are obvious limitations on the data which are available for this study. The data are heavily weighted in favor of the speaking medium over reading, with writing totally

neglected. They include both comprehension and production roles, with some emphasis on comprehension, but completely neglect the inner role. However, they are more thorough with respect to the domains, including four of the six. Thus the inferences to be drawn from the data must be tempered with this perspective on the relation of the data to the universe.

It was decided to combine the five indicators of language usage into an index as the inferences to be drawn from such a multi-faceted single indicator would be broader than those possible on the basis of the individual items. Various approaches to the relative weighting of the five indicators in the index of language usage could be employed. This sort of index was utilized in previous research (Kuvlesky and Patella, 1970) with all items weighted equally. The drawback to this approach is that it assumes that the interaction context (Fishman's "speaking") is more important than the non-interaction contexts (reading and writing), as there are three indicators of the former and only two of the latter, thus giving the former greater weight. There is no basis in theory or research to date to either support or refute this assumption, and thus it would be less arbitrary for the present to weight the interaction and

non-interaction contexts equally. Another alternative would be to separate the index into two or three subscores; that is, either an interaction subscore and a non-interaction subscore, or scores for speaking, reading and writing. The subscores would then be used separately in the analysis. The advantage of this approach is that it avoids any assumption concerning the relative weights which should be assigned the various media. However, there are two strong disadvantages to this approach: 1) the process of analysis becomes unmanageable; 2) more importantly, much of the value of an index is obviated. The aim of an index is to tap multiple aspects of a subject; if subindexes are created, however, each taps only a very limited realm of language behavior. Also, to be meaningful this study must ultimately make generalizations concerning language behavior as a whole, and this would not be possible except to a limited extent if the index were not used as a whole in the analysis. Therefore, it was decided to utilize all five items, and to equally weight the interaction items in the index with the non-interaction items.

A preliminary analysis of inter-item correlations among the five language usage items was performed in order to determine whether or not any two items might be

tapping the same things (Tables 1-4). There were two reasons for this analysis: first, it would provide more thorough understanding of the index; and second, in the case of the first three items, if any two of these were found to be highly correlated with each other but not with the third, one of the pair would be eliminated from the index. In this way the aspect tapped by those two items would not be unjustifiably given twice the weight of the aspect tapped by the third item. The interaction items, the first three, were examined for correlations in pairs, and the non-interaction items, the fourth and fifth, were tested for correlation. Four three-by-three contingency tables were prepared, one for each of the four comparisons. In the tables are presented numbers of respondents who gave each of the possible pairs of the responses 1, 2, and 3 to the two items under consideration. A chi-square test for independence of responses on the two items was performed in each case. All of the four hypotheses of independence of the pairs of items were rejected. On the basis of the chi-square values obtained, all of which were extremely high, it was concluded that there was a high dependence among all of the first three items, and a high dependence also between the fourth and fifth items.

Table 1. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of he Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 2b, Language Used With Parents and 29c, Language Used With Close Friends in Neighborhood.

29b	29c Response 1	2	3	Total
Response				
1	22	1	12	35
2	20	205	163	38
3	41	32	100	73
Total	83	238	275	96

$X^2 = 138.73^*$

*This value is significant at P<.01

Table 2. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29b, Language Used With Parents, and 29d, Language Used With Close Friends Outside Class.

29b	29d Response 1	2	3	Total
Response				
1	31	1	7	39
2	60	114	197	371
3	66	12	108	186
Total	157	127	312	596

$X^2 = 99.6^*$

*This value is significant at $p<.01$

Table 3. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 29c, Concerning Language Used With Close Friends in Neighborhood, and 29d, Language Used With Friends Outside Class.

29b	29d Response 1	2	3	Total
Response				
1	63	1	18	82
2	22	108	108	238
3	72	18	186	276
Total	157	127	312	596

$X^2 = 405^*$

Table 4. Numbers of Respondents Giving Each of the Possible Pairs of Responses to Items 30, Concerning Radio Programs Listened to, and 31, Magazines and Newspapers Read.

30	31 Response 1	2	3 or 4	Total
Response				
1	128	23	2	153
2	170	146	3	319
3 or 4	33	67	24	124
Total	331	236	26	596

$X^2 = 186.54^*$

*This value is significant at P<.01

On the basis of this test, it was decided to formulate the index by including all of the first three items in the index, with a total weight equal to that of the last two items. Thus the index draws half of its weight from the three interaction items and half from the two non-interaction items. More specifically, the responses were coded in the following way: for the first three (language used with parents, with close friends in the neighborhood, with close friends at school), answers received these values, English = 1, Spanish = 5, about the same amount of both = 3. For the fourth and fifth, answers received the following values: none = 1, some = 3, more-than-half or all = 5 (these two were combined so that the scoring of these two items would parallel that for the other three).[4] Thus, for example, if a particular respondent answered such that his scores for the first three items were 3, 3, and 5, and his scores for the last two were 1 and 3, his index would be computed as follows:

$$2/3(3+3+5) + (1+3) = 11.33$$

Family

The specific indicators of ethnicity as measured by

---

[4]This particular coding, rather than, for example, 1, 2, and 3, was utilized in order to maximize the range of variability of the index.

characteristics of family of orientation and aspirations for future family of procreation in each of the areas described in the framework for study are discussed in detail below and related to the hypothesis under test.

Characteristics of Family of Orientation

Contact with Mexico. As stated above, Mexico is an important source of Mexican American culture. Ideally this area of investigation would be tapped by means of data concerning travel of individuals between the United States and Mexico, and concerning contact with persons residing in Mexico or recently arrived from Mexico. However, this study will examine the area of contact with Mexico only in terms of whether or not an individual's parents were born there, by means of the following question: "Where were your parents born? (Give the town and state.)"[5] Answers will be coded simply with respect to birthplace in Mexico or in the United States. The assumption here, admittedly a broad one, is that a parent born in Mexico would cause a greater input of the Mexican culture in his family than a parent born in the United States. Thus as birthplace information is examined in relation to language usage, it is assumed that if both

---

[5]See Appendix for all items as presented.

parents of a respondent were born in Mexico, the influence of the subculture (which has Mexico as its source), and thus identification with it, will be strong; if one parent was born in Mexico and one in the United States, the influence will be less, as will identification with the subculture. If neither parent was born in Mexico, the influence and identification will be weaker yet. In accordance with the hypothesis of this study, preference of Spanish should be greatest for the individual both of whose parents were born in Mexico, less for the individual one of whose parents was born in Mexico and one in the United States, and least of all for the individual both of whose parents were born in the United States.

Roles of the parents and working of women outside the home. The description of the roles of mother and father above indicates that the father in the typical Mexican American home is the breadwinner, having major responsibility for support of the family, and that the mother is expected to remain within the home. This area will be tapped by means of three questions: (1) "Who is the major money earner in the family? (Father, Mother, Brother, Sister, Other, or Insurance, Social Security or something like this.)"; (2) "Is your father (or step-father) presently employed outside the home? (Yes, full-

time; Yes, part-time; No, but is looking for work No, does not work and is not looking for work outside the home; Have no father or stepfather; Don't know.)"; (3) "Is your mother (or stepmother) presently employel outside the home? (Same responses as above.) With respect to the first question, given that the father is living, the family situation most typical of the Mexican American subculture would be one in which he himself was the major money earner, rather than someone else. An atypical family would be one in which someone other than the father was the major money earner. Thus, under the hypothesis, an individual from the former type of family would be expected to show a stronger preference for Spanish than an individual from the latter type. With respect to the second question, likewise, the faily situation most typical of the Mexican American sbculture would be one in which the father works or is looing for work while one where he does not would be atypicl. Thus, according to the hypothesis, an individual from he former type of family would be expected to show stronger preference for Spanish than an individual from tc latter type. With respect to the third question, the imily in which the mother works or is looking for work wald be atypical in the Mexican American subculture, whic a

family in which the mother does not work and is not looking for work would be typical. Thus, under the hypothesis, an individual in the latter situation would be expected to show a stronger preference for Spanish than an individual in the former situation.

Divorce. On the basis of the above description of the Mexican family, divorce may be considered atypical of the subculture. By extension, separation may be considered likewise atypical, but not as strongly in conflict with the subculture as would be divorce. The following question was used to determine marital status of the parents: "What is the marital status of your mother and father? (Both alive, living together; both alive, separated; both alive, divorced; father not living; mother not living; neither father nor mother living.)" Of the respondents who gave any one of the first three answers, the first is most typical of the subculture, the second less so, and the third least of all. Under the hypothesis, then, an individual with the first type family would be expected to show the strongest preference for Spanish, the second, a weaker preference, and the third, the weakest of all.

Education. The description of the Mexican American subculture indicates that education is less emphasized

for girls than for boys, and it is felt by members of the subculture that a woman should not have more education than her husband. Education of the parents was determined here by means of the following question: "What was the highest school grade completed by your father and mother? (Did not go to school, grade 1-7, eighth grade, some high school but didn't graduate, graduated from high school, went to vocational school after graduating from high school, some college but didn't graduate, college graduate, don't know.)" Thus, of those respondents who gave any but the last answer, the situation most typical of the subculture is one in which the father has a higher level of education than the mother. A situation in which both parents had the same level would be less typical, and a situation in which the mother has a higher level of education than the father would be least typical of all. Under the hypothesis, an individual in the first type family would be expected to show a strong preference for Spanish, an individual in the second, a weaker preference, and an individual in the third, a weaker preference yet.

Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation

Importance of family relative to other goals and involvements. Information concerning this area was gathered by asking respondents to rank the following life goals: "To have lots of free time to do what I want; To get all the education I want; To earn as much money as I can; To get the job I want most; To live in the kind of place I like best; To have the kind of house, car furniture, and other things like this I want; To get married and raise a family." On the basis of Parsons' assertion that the Mexican American subculture is typical of the particularistic-ascriptive type value pattern, the achievement oriented goals above would all be inconsistent with the subculture, while "To get married and raise a family" would be a goal highly consistent with the subculture. Thus, an individual who strongly identified with the subculture would be expected to give that goal a rank of "1." Likewise, the lower the rank assigned this goal, the less strong the identification with the subculture. Under the hypothesis, then, the higher the rank an individual assigns to the family goal, the stronger would be his preference for Spanish.

Desire to marry: This information was obtained by means of the following question: "Do you want to get

married some day? (Yes, No, Already married.)" In accordance with the high importance of the family in the Mexican American subculture, desire to marry or present status of being married would be considered typical of the subculture, while desire not to marry would be atypical. Under the hypothesis, an individual who desired to marry or was married would be expected to have a stronger preference for Spanish than a person who did not desire to marry.

Ideal family size. This area was measured by means of the question "How many children do you want?" Given the strong influence of the Catholic church in the subculture and its proscription of birth control, a small projected number of children would be atypical of the subculture, and would reflect a weak identification with it, while a large number would be typical of the subculture and would reflect a strong identification with it. According to the hypothesis, then, individuals who gave each of these responses, from the low numbers to the high, would be expected to show an increasing preference for Spanish.

Working of women outside the home. This area was tapped by means of the following guestion: for girls, "What do you want to do about work outside the home after

you are married?"; for boys, "If you get married would you want your wife to work outside the home? (Not work outside the home at all, work part-time until I have a child, work full-time until I have a child, work part-time even after I have children, work full-time even after I have children.) As was mentioned above, working of women outside the home is definitely inconsistent with the Mexican American subculture. Thus the first response would be the most typical and would reflect the strongest identification with the subculture. The succeeding responses involve progressively greater commitment of the wife outside the home, and lessening of commitment to the home. Therefore the responses are successively less typical of the subculture and reflect progressively weaker identification with the subculture. According to the hypothesis, individuals who gave each in this series of responses would be expected to show a decreasing preference for Spanish.

Controls

It was pointed out in the discussion of language usage above that there are numerous factors influencing language usage. Thus it is clear that in order to evaluate the correlation of language usage with the specific isolated family characteristics listed above,

it is important to control as many of the variables which might disguise the hypothesized relationship as possible within the limitations of the data. Among the many theoretically influential variables discussed previously, three may be controlled in this study: sex, place of residence (city, town, country-non-farm, and farm), and residence on/not on the the Mexican border (see Appendix for these items as presented). Since these were theoretically important variables posited with reference to bilingual groups in general and not to this particular group, it could not be known whether or not these controls were necessary until these particular data were examined. Some evidence does exist to indicate that sex and place of residence are influential variables for this population. Kuvlesky and Patella (1970:7), using a slightly different index based upon this same data, found that while boys and girls demonstrated a similar pattern of language usage in the three interaction situations, the use of Spanish in all three was greater for boys than for girls. Thus sex should definitely be examined as a tentative control. Skrabanek (1969:7), in a study of Mexican Americans in a rural and urban area of Texas, found that "the urban household heads use Spanish slightly less than the rural residents." Thus the place

of residence variable is worthy of consideration as a control in the study which concerns a population similar to that of the Skrabanek study. There is no evidence known to the author concerning the importance of the border/non-border variable for this population, so it will be examined solely on the basis of more general literature (discussed in the Review of Literature). As these three controls may be important then, but at the same time would complicate the analysis a great deal, it was decided to subject them to a preliminary analysis.

In order to determine whether or not the data could be considered to be normally distributed, and thus would allow the use of a parametric statistical test, a Riedwyl Goodness of Fit Test for normality of the index (Speed and Smith, 1969) using both males and females was performed (Table 5). As the standard deviation and the mean had to be estimated from the data, the Modified Riedwyl Tables were used. On the basis of this test with a significance level of .05, the hypothesis of normality could not be rejected. Thus it was considered valid to utilize an analysis of variance statistical model.

Each of the three tentative controls was analyzed in its relation to language usage patterns. Due to the

Table 5. Riedwyl Goodness of Fit Test: Frequency Distribution for Index by Sex.

Index	Males	Females	Total
4	5	13	18
5	7	16	23
6	9	12	21
7	3	7	10
8	19	24	43
9	16	14	30
10	39	35	74
11	27	31	58
12	43	36	79
13	19	28	47
14	45	29	74
15	7	15	22
16	31	18	49
17	1	3	4
18	12	12	24
19	0	0	0
20	6	8	14
Total	289	301	590

$n^2Tn = 31^1 = .05$

Note: In this table and in the frequency and percentage distribution tables in the Appendix, there are no respondents with an index value of 19. This is because such a value is an arithmetic impossibility given that the three possible code values are 1, 3, and 5, and the weighting of the items in the index which was utilized.

[1]The hypothesis of normality could not be rejected as this value was not found to be statistically significant.

sampling procedure[6] it was considered statistically important to include county and high school as tentative controls. As border/non-border residence was determined on the basis of high school attended, the high school variable was considered to be a suitable tool for evaluating the border/non-border control under consideration. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 6.[7] The Anova yielded highly significant F values for sex (.01>P>.005) and county (.005>P>.001), while place of residence and high school (border/non-border residence) were not found to be significant. It was decided then that both of these factors should be statistically controlled in the main analysis; however, only the sex variable will be incorporated into the discussion of language usage in relation to the various family characteristics.[8] County is excluded from the

---

[6]The respondents comprised the entire tenth grade Mexican American population in all the seven high schools of the four counties present at school on the day of the data collection.

[7]The computer program utilized in the analysis was the GLHYP/HOH, September 1, 1969 version, which is appropriate in light of the unbalanced cell sizes here and the nested character of the tentative controls.

[8]Frequency and percentage distributions of the index for sex, place of residence and border/non-border residence are provided by way of supplement in the Appendix.

Table 6. Analysis of Variance With Respect to Index of Language Usage.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Sex	1	90.1521	90.15	7.28[1]
County	3	172.063	57.35	4.63[2]
High School in County	3	73.9465	24.65	1.99[3]
Place of Residence	3	71.2038	23.73	1.92[4]
Pooled Interactions	38	522.825	13.76	1.11
Within	541	6697.98	12.38	
Total	589	7635.33	12.96	

[1]The sex variable was found to be significant at a level of .01>P>.005.

[2]The county variable was found to be significant at a level of .005>P>.001.

[3]The high school in county variable was found to be not significant for P = .10.

[4]The place of residence variable was found to be not significant for P = .10.

Table 7. Mean Index by Sex, Place of Residence, and Border/Non Border Residence.

	City	Town	Country	Farm
Male				
Border	12.175439	12.303030	12.880000	12.000000
NB	11.866667	12.358974	12.833333	12.156863
Female				
Border	11.498471	11.398148	12.313725	11.541667
NB	11.333333	11.437500	11.925926	12.583333

discussion because it is presumed to be theoretically meaningless in relation to the subculture.[9]

Statistical Analysis

All data will be analyzed by means of the analysis of variance F-test, with tables of mean indices being consulted in each case as well.[10]

---

[9]However, the author intends to pursue this interesting finding of such highly significant variability in the near future.

[10]The computer program used will be the Zerbe Least Squares Analysis.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The purpose of this section is to examine the analysis of variance and the table of means for each of the eleven segments of the data utilized. As explained above, the aim is to determine the existence, as evidenced by this data, of any correlation between relative usage of Spanish and certain family characteristics which are considered to be indicators of ethnic identification. Or, more generally, the aim is to determine the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnicity. The segments of the data are discussed in the following order:

Characteristics of family of orientation:

(1) Birthplace of parents
(2) Major money earner
(3) Employment of father
(4) Employment of mother
(5) Marital status of parents
(6) Relative education of parents

and

Characteristics of future family of procreation:

(1) Relative importance of family
(2) Desire to marry
(3) Desire of males for wife to work
(4) Desire of females to work after marriage
(5) Ideal family size.

Characteristics of Family of Orientation

Birthplace of Parents

The F-test on the questionnaire item concerning birthplace of parents (Table 8) yielded a value significant at a very high level (for males, .001>P>.0005; for females, P<.0005) for both males and females. Examination of the table of means indicates that for both males and females, the mean index of language usage decreases from left to right; that is, respondents both of whose parents were born in Mexico had the highest mean index, and respondents both of whose parents were born in the U.S. had the lowest mean index, with those respondents having one parent born in each country having a mean index falling between the other two. The magnitude of the significant difference in means in index points is not especially great for the males (1.5 index points) but is quite large for the females (4 index points). Thus the table of means discloses that the significant differences found by the F-test between the three treatments exists in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. The general hypothesis of a correlation between preference of Spanish and identification with the subculture is upheld in this case.

Major Money Earner

In this case, the F-test (Table 9) failed to yield a significant statistic for either males or females. Thus the hypothesis was not upheld by the data for either the males or the females.

Employment of the Father

The F-test (Table 10) indicates a rather highly significant difference between the two treatments for the males (.05>P>.025), but examination of the table of means indicates that the difference found is in the direction contrary to that predicted by the hypothesis. The mean index of language usage is higher for those respondents whose father is not working or looking for work, rather than the reverse. For the females, there was also a significant difference found between the two groups, and the difference is in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. However, as the table of means indicates, the magnitude of the difference is small, only about .44 index points. This difference is not considered to be meaningful. Thus the hypothesis is not supported by the females and is strongly contradicted by the males.

Employment of the Mother

The F-test (Table 11) yielded a significant value of

the statistic for the males (.10>P>.05). The table of means supports this result in that the mean index of language usage is higher for those respondents whose mother is not working or looking for work than for the others. This significant difference, though not especially large (1 index point), is thus in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. The value of F yielded by the data of the females was not significant. Thus in this case, the hypothesis is supported by the males but not by the females.

Marital Status of Parents

The F-test (Table 12) yielded a significant value of F for both males and females (.10>P>.05). But as before, the table of means shows the significant difference to be not in the pattern predicted by the hypothesis. According to the hypothesis, the mean indices of language usage should decrease from left to right across the table. However, as shown in the table, the lowest mean index was achieved by those males whose parents are separated, and the intermediate value of the mean index, by those whose parents are divorced. The highest mean index, on the other hand, was achieved as predicted by those whose parents are living together. Thus the hypothesis was not

supported by either males or females, although it should be noted that the group of males whose parents are living together did support the hypothesis. However, the difference between their mean index and that of the males whose parents are divorced (.57 index points) would probably not be shown to be significant.

Relative Education of Parents

The F-test (Table 13) on this item yielded a statistic for the males which was not significant. For the females, the F-test yielded a highly significant statistic (.025>P>.01). However, once again examination of the table of means indicates that the significant difference found between the treatments is not in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. Rather the highest mean index is that of the "Equal Amounts" category of respondents. Likewise contradictory to the hypothesis is the fact that of the other two categories, that of "mother's education greater" has a higher mean than "father's education greater". Thus the data for neither the males nor the females support the hypothesis.

Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation

Relative Importance of Family

The F-test (Table 14) in the case yielded a significant result for the males (.10>P>.05). However, the mean indices for the male increase with great regularity from left to right, that is, in the direction opposite to that predicted by the hypothesis. The F-value for females was not significant. Thus the data in this case do not support the hypothesis for either males or females.

Desire to Marry

Likewise in this case, the F-test (Table 15) failed to yield a significant result for either males or females. Thus the data fail to support the hypothesis which predicted that the mean index for those respondents desiring to marry or now married would be significantly higher than for those not desiring to marry.

Desire of Males for Wife to Work

The F-test (Table 16) failed to yield a significant statistic, and the hypothesis, which predicted that the value of the mean index would decrease from left to right acorss the table was not supported. The categories were

not significantly different.

Desire of Females to Work After Marriage

In contrast, the F-test (Table 17) in this case yielded a rather highly significant value (.025>P>.01). As well, the table of means shows this significant difference among the categories to be in the direction predicted, fairly large (2.5 index points), and highly regular as well. The values for the main index decrease from left to right as the involvement with work of the females increase, thus supporting the hypothesis.

Ideal Family Size

The F-test (Table 18) yielded a rather highly significant result for the males (.025>P>.01). Examination of the table of means demonstrates that this very significant difference between the categories is generally in the direction predicted by the hypothesis and is quite large. The smallest ideal family size (1 child) category has likewise the lowest mean index of language usage. The values then jump sharply to about 12, increase to about 13 at the family size 5, and generally stay there,

with one exception (7 children).[11] Thus this data for the males may be said to support the hypothesis. The F-test for the females likewise yielded a highly significant result (.05>P>.025), but examination of the table of means shows that this significance was probably produced in great part by the value in the category "7", where the mean index is the highest possible, 20. If, however, this category containing only one respondent is ignored, the predicted trend still does not exist; there is no semblance of a regular increase in the value of the mean index from left to right. Thus, while the data of the males does support the hypothesis, that of the females does not.

---

[11] It should be noted, however, that this category has a very small number of respondents in it (Appendix, Table 35).

Table 8. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Birthplace of Parents.[1]

	Anova		Birthplace of Parents: Mean Index			
Sex of R	F	P	Both in Mexico	One in US/ One in Mexico	Both in US	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate
Males	6.96*	.001>P>.0005	13.47	12.43	12.02	1.5
Females	8.29*	P=.0005	14.41	12.44	10.58	4

[1]See Appendix D and corresponding table number for complete analysis of variance for this and all succeeding items.

Table 9. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Major Money Earner.

Major Money Earner

Anova			Mean Index	
Sex of R	F	P	Father	Other
Males	2.66	P=.10	12.11	13.06
Females	1.52	P=.10	11.63	11.61

Table 10. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Father.

Employment of Father

Anova			Mean Index	
Sex of R	F	P	Working or Looking for work	Not working or looking for work
Males	4.96*	.05>P>.025	12.10	13.71
Females	2.88*	.10>P>.05	11.63	11.19

Table 11. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Mother.

	Employment of Mother				
	Anova		Mean Index		
Sex of R	F	P	Working or looking for work	Not working or looking for work	Magnitude of Differences in Index Points: Approximate
Males	2.98*	.10>P>.05	11.63	12.65	1
Females	.154	P=.10	11.31	11.78	

Table 12. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Marital Status of Parents (where both are alive).

	Marital Status of Parents				
	Anova		Mean Index		
Sex of R	F	P	Living Together	Separated	Divorced
Males	2.57*	.10>P>.05	12.37	7.87	11.80
Females	2.80*	.10>P>.05	11.65	11.85	10.40

Table 13. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Education of Parents.

	Relative Education of Parents				
	Anova		Mean Index		
Sex of R	F	P	Father's Greater Than Mother's	Equal Amounts for both	Mother's Greater Than Father's
Males	1.87	P=.10	11.99	12.74	11.87
Females	3.85*	.025>P>.01	10.62	12.39	11.37

Table 14. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Importance of Family.

	Relative Importance of Family								
	Anova		Mean Index						
Sex of R	F	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Males	1.86*	.10>P>.05	10.56	11.43	11.74	11.83	12.86	12.83	12.26
Females	1.35	P=.10	12.40	12.12	10.14	11.56	12.44	11.25	11.72

Table 15. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Desire to Marry.

	Desire to Marry			
	Anova		Mean Index	
Sex of R	F	P	Desires to Marry or is now Married	Does not Desire to Marry
Males	.161	P=.10	12.29	12.04
Female	.359	P=.10	11.60	11.74

Table 16. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males With Respect to Desire for Wife to Work.

		Desire for Wife to Work				
		Anova	Mean Index			
F	P	Not Work	Part-time til Child	Full-time til Child	Part-time After Children	Full-time After Children
.43	P=.10	12.38	11.68	12.46	11.75	11.83

Table 17. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Females With Respect to Desire to Work After Marriage.

Anova		Desire to Work After Marriage Mean Index					
F	P	Not Work	Part-time til Child	Full-time til Child	Part-time After Children	Full-time After Children	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate
3.3*	.025>P>.01	13.32	11.18	11.03	10.72	10.80	2.5

Table 18. Results of Anova and Mean Index of Language Usage of Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Ideal Family Size.

	Anova		Ideal Family Size Mean Index								
Sex of R	F	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or More	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate
Males	2.42*	.025>P>.01	6.67	12.25	11.77	11.90	12.92	13.69	11.56	13.09	6.5
Females	2.17*	.05>P>.025	15.20	12.06	11.32	11.11	12.67	11.81	20.00	8.48	

Summary

The results are complex, and are therefore summarized in Table 19. In general, the hypothesis was not supported by this data. The following cases, however, were exceptions to that pattern and did support the hypothesis:

1. Birthplace of parents; males and females
2. Employment of the mother; males
3. Desire of females to work after marriage
4. Ideal family size; males

The magnitude of the significant difference found in these cases varied from a small one in the second case to a quite large one in the fourth case.

Table 19. Summary of Results

Variable Under Consideration	Results of Statistical Evaluation			Support of Hypothesis
	Significant F value	Direction of Difference as Predicted	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points Approximate:	
1. Birthplace of parents	M, Yes F, Yes	Yes Yes	1.5 4	Yes Yes
2. Major money earner	M, No F, No	No		No No
3. Employment of the father	M, Yes F, Yes	No Yes	.44[1]	No No
4. Employment of the mother	M, Yes F, No	Yes	1	Yes No
5. Marital status of parents	M, Yes F, Yes	No No		No No
6. Relative education of parents	M, No F, Yes	No No		No No
7. Relative importance of family	M, Yes F, No	No		No
8. Desire to marry	M, No F, No			No

Table 19. Summary of Results (continued)

Variable Under Consideration	Results of Statistical Evaluation			Support of Hypothesis
	Significant F Value	Direction of Difference as Predicted	Magnitude of Difference in Index Points: Approximate	
9. Desire of males for wife to work	No			No
10. Desire of females to work after marriage	Yes	Yes	2.5	Yes
11. Ideal family size	M, Yes F, Yes	Yes	6.5	Yes

[1]It was decided that differences in magnitude of less than one index point would not be interpreted as sociologically meaningful. This is clearly an arbitrary cut-off point.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

This chapter will concentrate upon evaluation of the results presented in the preceding chapter. The aims will be several: first, to discuss why the data generally did no- support the hypothesis, and explore reasons for the four exceptional cases in which it did; and second, to draw such conclusions as are possible from this data concerning the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnicity.

In light of the unsupported hypothesis, two possible explanations must be recognized: one, the true life situation does not support it, or two, the indicators are faulty and do not measure reality. If the first of these is concluded to be the case, it must be reconciled with the basic assumptions which led to the hypothesis, and these assumptions must be reformed where necessary. If the second is to be given responsibility, then the weakness must be sought in the indicators. All of these avenues of explanation will be investigated. First, if the actuality of language usage and ethnicity has been tapped

by the indicators, and the true life situation simply does not support the hypothesis, then a faulty assumption led to the formation of the hypothesis. In this study, the individual hypotheses related to each item were based upon assumptions concerning the nature of the Mexican American subculture. The description of the subculture from which each of the assumptions was drawn is a widely accepted one, verified throughout the literature concerning Mexican Americans. This literature, however, is open to challenge on one score, namely that it is primarily subjective and descriptive, there being little hard objective data concerning the nature of the subculture. Until such data exists, we will have to settle for the more subjective understanding of the subculture that we have to date.

Second, responsibility for the unsupported hypothesis may rest with the indicators used, and thus they must be evaluated in detail to determine how well they may have tapped reality. If the indicators are particularly weak, the explanation for the unsupported hypothesis will have to rest here until better ones are developed and utilized. If, on the other hand, the indicators generally should have done their job, we will have to return to the above explanation for the

unsupported hypothesis, namely that it simply is not true to the best of our knowledge at this point.

The index of language usage may be questioned for the reasons set forth in the original discussion of it. The index is heavily weighted in favor of the speaking medium over the reading medium, with writing totally neglected. Likewise both comprehension and production roles are tapped, with greater weight on the former, but the inner role is not tapped at all. It was felt that the elements of the index as available were too valuable to discard, even in view of these limitations. It may be, however, that the imbalance of aspects has yielded a completely unrealistic picture of language usage, and thus the unsupported hypothesis. Only a more detailed investigation of language usage patterns of Mexican Americans than has ever been attempted would reveal the degree of validity of the index utilized here.

Likewise open to question in view of the generally unsupported hypothesis, even if the index of language usage is valid, are the indicators of ethnic identification. The first item, concerning "Birthplace of parents," was considered in the original discussion of it, a somewhat weak indicator of contact with Mexico. The items concerning the major money earner and the

working of the two parents outside the home are very direct and should tap the area of interest very adequately. The item concerning marital status is likewise very direct and should be expected to tap the area of interest well, as should the items concerned with relative education of the parents, relative importance of the family, desire to marry, desire for the females to work outside the home after marriage, and ideal family size. These items are all well constructed and straightforward, and seem to be capable of tapping their respective areas as well as possible. The indicators as a group do not, however, measure the entire broad spectrum of subcultural aspects which might be utilized as indicators of ethnic identification. They seem to involve many important areas, but excluded is a large group of potential indicators of a behavioral nature. For example, a profitable area might be membership in subculturally oriented volunteer associations such as UMAS (United Mexican American Students) or MAYO (Mexican American Youth Organization), the latter having an increasing popularity among the geographical and age group of the subjects. Another possible area, much more difficult to tap, is the subtler behavioral identifiers used among members of the subculture to identify

themselves to each other as loyal and proud members of the ethnic group. These might include details of gesture, dress, word usage, accent, ideas, etc. It cannot be known if this type of indicator would yield results consistent with those found here until they are examined empirically.

Needless to say, the researcher is always faced with the question of the ability of his subjects to report their actual beliefs and behavior. Then too, he must be hounded by doubts concerning the efficiency of his data collection, the role of interaction between the subjects and the interviewers, especially in a crosscultural situation such as this. But these problems were dealt with as well as possible at the outset of the project. The other remaining major question concerns the choice of population; can it be questioned for some reason, or considered atypical of Mexican American subgroups in this country? But it too can only be described as particularly appropriate for this study, as was explained in "Source of data."

As far as can be determined here, then, the indicators, with the one exception noted, must be accepted as sound. The conclusion must be that our understanding of the nature of the subculture is not complete,

although it may well be valid as far as it goes. Exploration of subtle characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes which may truly signal ethnic identification will probably explain that the unsupported hypothesis is due to the fact that ethnicity is not, for this subculture, tied to the obvious and perhaps superficial subcultural characteristics relied upon here, but rather to more elusive aspects. For this subculture as tapped by the indicators used here, the hypothesis generally does not reflect reality; language usage is not a valid indicator of ethnic identification. The exceptions which supported the hypothesis cannot, of course, be ignored. If the hypothesis is generally untrue, why was it upheld in several cases?

In the first case, that of "Birthplace of parents," two explanations must be explored; one, this indicator may be simply too weak, as discussed above, to tap reality; two, this indicator may be in a class apart from the others; with respect to the latter possibility, the individual hypotheses related to each item were, in general, based upon assumptions drawn from the nature of the subculture. The hypothesis concerning "Birthplace of parents" is an exception, for it is based upon a broader sociolinguistic assumption concerning how the

young acquire their mother culture, whatever it be; this assumption is not tied to any specific assumptions in regard to the Mexican American subculture alone. It may be, then, that this assumption is more firmly founded than the others, which, as was remarked above, rest alone upon subjective description of the particular subculture. Acceptance of this possibility thus sheds doubt on the reliability of the existing understanding of the Mexican American subculture. This researcher finds no clear basis for supporting either of these two possibilities over the other. Therefore, the following conclusion with respect to this exceptional item is put forth: it will be assumed until a better indicator can be tested that this one is too weak to be valid. A reservation accompanies this assumption; until solid objective data is collected concerning the nature of the subculture, the possibility that a true misunderstanding of it exists cannot be denied.

The second item which supported the hypothesis instead of failing to support it as did the majority dealt with "Employment of mother." The hypothesis related to this item was based upon an assumption that the subculture is male-oriented with the father having full responsibility for the support of the family, and upon

the much-described ethic of "machismo" which exists. However, the fact that the results of the data in this case were contrary to the results in general, and were split, with the males supporting the hypothesis and the females not supporting it demands a re-examination of the assumptions. The most likely explanation for this disparity is that males and females should not be expected to react to these elements of the culture in the same way. It is necessary in developing this explanation to consider not just this one exceptional item, but rather all three of the items which were based upon the same assumptions, namely those items concerning "Major money earner," "Employment of father," and "Employment of mother." The "machismo" ethic could cause a young man whose mother worked outside the home, and thus challenged the masculinity of the man in her family, to become alienated from his subculture in order to rationalize this cultural inconsistency. A young woman, on the other hand, would not be subject to this ethic, her mother's working would not affect her in the same way, and thus this circumstance would have little or no implication for her identification with the subculture. Thus, language usage may be a good indicator of ethnicity for males in this case, but not for females, because working

of the mother carries more emotional implications for the males than for the females. Likewise it may be that unemployment of the father occurs only involuntarily on the father's part, and is looked upon by his children, male and female, as only an unfortunate circumstance which has no implications for him in his masculine role as head of the family. Thus, if the question concerning major money earner had been dealt with differently, with the "mother" category separated out from the general "Other," the same effect may well have been observed among the males. In summary, then, the inconsistent result obtained on the "Employment of mother" item was probably due to a faulty assumption concerning the importance of the "machismo" ethic for males as opposed to females.

The third exception to the general trend of an unaccepted hypothesis occurred in relation to the "Desire of females to work after marriage." Again, this item must be examined in tandem with another closely related item, that concerning "Desire of males for wife to work." It is important to point out that in the case of the group of items discussed above, we were dealing with ascribed characteristics of the respondents' families, while in this case we are dealing with respondents'

aspirations. Thus while the subjects had no control over the former, they do have control over the latter, and the assumptions underlying the hypotheses, which were essentially the same for both groups of data, may be expected to operate differently in the two cases. That is, the nature of the subculture worked upon the respondents with no interference from them in the former case, while in the latter, they are capable of exerting personal influence as they place themselves in response categories, rather than being placed there by ascriptive characteristics of their families. Thus while a young female may be passive and little affected by her mother's working in terms of her own identification with the subculture, she is very much affected when it comes to making a personal decision about her life's course, namely whether or not she will work after marriage. And as she makes this active decision, she must deal directly with the subculture and either accept or reject what it has taught her about her role in society and in the family. Thus for the females, language usage is a good indicator of ethnic identification. As with the females, who were more passive bystanders than the males in the case of "Employment of mother," the males in this case are making choices for their wives, not for themselves.

Thus while the "machismo" aspect of the subculture no doubt has some effect on them, this effect is outweighed by the fact that they are not as directly involved with the choice as are the females, and thus do not make the same strongly active acceptance or rejection of the mother culture as do the females in deciding whether females should work after marriage. Thus it seems that here again a faulty assumption was made that the subculture should act in the same way upon both sexes, and that any assumptions based upon the nature of the subculture will apply in the same way to both.

The fourth and final exception to the rule of an unaccepted hypothesis concerned "Ideal family size." It seems that two factors may be operating here, but again both coming under the classification of "mistaken assumption that both males and females are affected in the same way by the nature of the subculture." The first of these two factors is the Catholic religion which prescribes large families, and proscribes the use of birth control. This, and the fact that the women are known to be more active practitioners of the religion would lead one to expect that if an inconsistent result were to be obtained on this item, it would be in the opposite direction; that is, the females would support the

hypothesis, while the males would not. However, another aspect of the culture enters in here, and was not adequately developed in the consideration of the hypothesis related to this item. That aspect is, again, the "machismo" which is taught so thoroughly to the males. It seems that this element must have outweighed the others in the following way: the male has a stake in a large family which the female does not. The larger his family, the greater proof there is of his virility. The female not only is not affected in the same way by this consideration, but also she is the one who will have almost sole responsibility for the care and rearing of the children, a fact which might tempt her to limit the size of her family. In conclusion, language usage, then, may be considered a valid indicator of ethnicity in the case of the males with regard to "Ideal family size," but not in the case of the females.

It should be noted again that the data are in two categories, the ascribed characteristics of family of orientation, and the aspired for characteristics of future family of procreation. In the case of the first category there would be no reason to expect differences between males and females, as they have not chosen their own response categories for the questionnaire items, but

rather have been assigned to them by their family situation. This fact renders noteworthy the two cases within this first category in which the F-values for males and females were not either both significant or both not significant, but rather mixed. The first of these two cases is "Employment of mother." In this case the fact that a significant statistic existed for males but not for females is difficult to explain other than as a result of chance difference between the life situations of the particular respondents of this study. The second of the two cases is that of "Relative education of parents." In this case a significant statistic existed for females but not for males. This may well be due to simple ignornace on the part of the males as to the actual level of education attained by their parents which may have lead to guessing on their part. The females, on the other hand may have been more aware of their parents' education because they tend to spend more time in the home and to have a greater opportunity to learn such things.

In summary, these conclusions point out that no sweeping generalization may be made concerning the validity, or lack of validity, of language usage as an indicator of ethnic identification. It is clear that it

cannot be used generally nor in many seemingly obvious cases of ethnicity, but it may well be used in specific instances several of which showed up as the exceptional cases in this study. Also, correlation of language usage with a more behavioral type of indicator than those used here could well be expected. Whatever the results of future research aimed at specifying just which are the correlates of language usage, it must be noted that the numerous cases found here in which the correlation unexpectedly did not exist point out the impossibility of generalizing the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnic identification.

Implications

This chapter will focus upon the various implications of the conclusions drawn in the preceding section. An attempt will be made to evaluate implications in the following areas: 1) sociological theory; 2) past and future research; 3) methodology; and 4) social policy.

Theory

It was stated in the introduction to this study that the need to determine the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnicity became evident in light of the results of the recent analysis by Kuvlesky and Patella

(1970). As was explained, the hypothesis in that study was that a direct correlation should exist between upward mobility aspirations and ethnicity as measured by Spanish language usage. When this hypothesis was not supported by the data, the two basic assumptions underlying the hypothesis were examined; one, concerning the nature of the subculture, was considered a sound one in spite of the results. The second, concerning the validity of language usage as an indicator of ethnic identification, was still open to question. This study, then, has attempted to investigate that assumption. Given the results and conclusions discussed previously, it seems that in general language usage cannot be used as such an indicator. Sociolinguistic theory must abandon this naive notion which, as was pointed out in the review of literature, has already been shown to be dubious, and which in this study has been even further challenged. A much more complex approach to the question of language and culture, such as that suggested by Fishman, must be taken. Theorists should address themselves to the fact that culture and language interact differently for different individuals, especially where the difference is a sexual one, and age and other factors will surely be found to cause even further variability. Theorists must

begin to examine how and why language may relate in one way to certain aspects of a subculture, and in other ways to other aspects, even though all these aspects seem to be tightly interrelated. Likewise they must begin to consider as a part of the whole language versus culture question the relative importance of behavioral characteristics, and probe ways in which these might be related to ethnicity, and to language usage.

Despite the finding here that language usage is not a generally good indicator of ethnic identification, it will continue to be interpreted as such, and the theoretical significance of this fact must be explored. For example, the mobility orientations of Mexican Americans themselves may well be affected by their perception of the role their language usage can play in the successful realization of their aspirations. This perception would probably lead to differences between aspirations and expectations for mobility such as those found by Juarez (1968) in the same sample used in this study. This possible source of the difference, to the knowledge of the author, has not been investigated either theoretically or empirically.

Likewise actual mobility, known to be affected by racial discrimination for this subculture and others,

may be particularly affected by language usage of Mexican American potential employees. Employers, no doubt, assume that language usage is a good indicator of ethnicity, and in turn of a whole constellation of attitudes, beliefs, and probable behaviors. Thus the effect of language usage on actual mobility should be explored theoretically, with attention given to the following distinct areas: 1) Relative use of Spanish and English in various domains; and 2) English language ability, regardless of amount of use. These two areas should be considered separately and in tandem. Language usage, in spite of its questionable use as an indicator of ethnicity, must continue to be an important element of all theoretical dealings with bilingual subcultures.

Research

The implications relative to past research, in particular the Kuvlesky and Patella investigation (1970), are clear: their interesting finding of a lack of correlation between ethnicity (i.e. language usage) and upward mobility aspirations is now open to some question. Their index of language usage, though weighted differently than that used here, was composed of the same items. The findings of this study suggest that their index, like the one used here, may not have been a valid

indicator of ethnicity. Until the index is evaluated empirically in comparison with other indices, until more is known objectively about the subculture, and until the question of indicators of ethnicity, particularly behavioral ones, is explored further, it should be assumed that the results of their study, and other similar ones (i.e. Nall, 1962) should be interpreted in a less sweeping sense. As was remarked in the discussion of theory above, language usage, though questionable as an indicator of ethnic identification, is still a meaningful variable in its own right. The knowledge that the expected negative correlation between language usage and mobility aspirations does not exist extends our understanding of the subculture and demands further investigation of it.

Future research in this area, then, must investigate two main problems: 1) language usage, seeking to determine how it is best tapped for this subculture in particular, and for bilingual subcultures in general; and 2) ethnicity, aiming to discover empirically just what are the salient aspects of the Mexican American subculture, the "true" indicators of ethnic identification, both behavioral and non-behavioral. Once these two areas are explored, it will be possible to accomplish

on a grand scale that which was the aim at a more modest level in this study: it will be possible to determine precisely those aspects of ethnicity which correlate with language usage patterns, and those which do not. If the aim of the Kuvlesky and Patella study is to be advanced in the meantime, it will be necessary to use some other indicator of ethnic identification than language usage. Needless to say it will be difficult to find such an indicator without running into the same limitations as exist with language usage, namely the validity of the indicator.

Methodology

The methodological insights to be gained from this study are several. First, future investigation of the index, and of language usage in general, should rely upon Fishman's thorough table of domains, roles, and media, utilizing a greater number and variety of them than were availed of here. Also it should, instead of utilizing the index approach alone, seek to discover whether certain individual indicators of language usage will correlate with ethnicity, as the latter is measured in various ways.

Second, the sticky methodological problem of

determining ethnic identification must be explored. Perhaps it has not yet been tapped meaningfully. Future methodologists must apply their imaginations to direct and indirect means of eliciting this information from respondents. One interesting possibility, which has been used with this subculture in only a spotty fashion, is personal report. This method, even given the difficulties inherent in it, might well provide the most direct access to true ethnicity. As the Mexican American subculture continues to increase in awareness of the injustice which has been and is still being done it, the various members of the subculture, heterogeneous in many ways, may be becoming more homogeneous with respect to a feeling of common problems and causes. Thus the theoretical indicators to date may not be relevant, and a new indicator, accessible only via direct statement by the subjects may be the key.

Social Policy

The finding that language usage is not a generally good indicator of ethnic identification has practical significance in several areas. The most direct application is to the educational world, a critical one today for many Mexican American youngsters, as well as members

of other bilingual minorities such as the Indians. Teachers must no longer assume that because they perceive the language usage patterns of their students, they are equipped to extrapolate them to all other aspects of the students' attitudes and values. It may well be found ultimately that, for a given subculture, language is a powerful correlate of many aspects of an individual's outlook and behavior. However, at this point in time, the nature of those correlations is not known. Therefore no teacher attempting to deal with a bilingual youngster should assume that because "Juan" is very quiet except with his friends, and then he speaks only Spanish, he necessarily has any particular set of attitudes concerning his own ethnicity or toward the dominant subculture. The interaction of language and culture is a complex one. The following case may well exist: one particular youngster may speak predominantly Spanish, consider himself more Mexican than American, and reject certain aspects of Anglo culture while adopting others. A second youngster may speak predominantly English, and yet have exactly the same conformation of attitudes as the other. Likewise two students may use just the same amount of Spanish and have widely differing outlooks on life. Teachers today, given the state of knowledge on

the subject, simply cannot understand their students' values, attitudes, and behavior patterns just by hearing the language that comes out of their mouths; teachers must maintain open minds. Too often in the past minority youngsters have become victims of a self-fulfilling prophecy made by the teacher concerning their probable success in the school (eg. Deutsch, 1967). This unfortunate waste can be decreased significantly if teachers can manage to free themselves of ill-founded stereotypes such as those based on language usage.

The implications of the results of this study for employers of Mexican Americans parallel those for teachers. The employer must not attempt to deduce what his Mexican American employees feel and think on the basis of their language usage, nor should he try to guess on that basis what the job performance of a prospective employee will be.

More generally, these results point toward the need for social policy, particularly in education, to direct itself toward giving the people of Mexican American heritage an even chance in this society. In the past the schools have perpetrated a misguided effort to force acculturation upon the members of this subculture (as well as others). As a result, acculturation has

occurred to a high degree; withness the high mobility aspirations held by Mexican American youth in spite of the particularistic-ascriptive nature of the subculture. However, this acculturation has been achieved at the price of great violence to both a rich cultural heritage and to the individuals who should be its proud bearers. (Needless to say, there is a certain bias on the part of the author coloring this evaluation. But unless one believes that cultural subgroups in this country must be forced to blend in with the dominant culture to the point of rendering themselves indistinguishable from its other members, the bias is not an extreme one.) In the past, many educators have opposed bilingual education for fear that teaching of the Spanish language, and of the culture, would prevent acculturation (Andersson, 1969:72). However, this study has demonstrated that language is not a reliable predictor of ethnic identification, or of any attitudes or beliefs that we know of yet, so educators should not fear bilingual education on these grounds. Moreover, the acculturation which has begun will surely continue, and there is much reason to believe that were the educational experience of young Mexican Americans made more meaningful for them, they would achieve greater success in Anglo schools, and thus

in the Anglo society (Spilerman, 1971:114). Bilingual education, then, should be encouraged and expanded, and the sooner the better, with the goal being to provide bilingual education for all interested Mexican American youth, and members of other subcultures as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Theodore.
1969 Hispania "Bilingual schooling: Oasis or mirage?" 52:69-74.

Barber, Carroll.
1952 "Trilingualism in Pascua: Social functions of language in an Arizona Yaqui Village." Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Arizona.

Barker, George C.
1945 "The social functions of language." Etcetera 2:228-234.

Bronsnahan, L. F.
1963 "Some aspects of the linguistic situation in tropical Africa." Lingua 12:54-65.

Burma, John H.
1954 Spanish-speaking groups in the United States. Durham: Duke University Press.

Christian, Jane Macwab and Chester, Jr.
1966 "Spanish language and culture in the Southwest." Pp. 280-317 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Deutsch, Martin.
1967 "Some psychological aspects of learning in the disadvantaged." Pp. 320-326 in E. Paul Torrance and Robert D. Strom (ed.). Mental health and achievement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Edmonson, Munro S.
1957 Los manitos: A study of institutional values. New Orleans: Middle American Research Institute, Tulane University.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M.
1968 "An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener." Pp. 192-211 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1966 Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
1966 "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry." Pp. 424-454 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
1968 Readings in the sociology of language. The Hauge: Mouton.

Fishman, Joshua A., and Vladimir C. Nahirny.
1966 "The ethnic group school in the United States." Pp. 306-317 in Joshua A. Fishman, (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Gonzales, Nancie.
1967 The Spanish Americans of New Mexico: A distinctive heritage. Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, University of California at Los Angeles.

Haugen, Einar.
1954 "Some pleasures and problems of bilingual research." International journal of American linguistics 20:116-122.

Hayden, Robert G.
1966 "Some community dynamics of language maintenance." Pp. 190-205 in Joshua Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Heller, Celia S.
1966 Mexican American Youth: Forgotten youth at the crossroads. New York: Random House.

Herman, S. N.
1961 "Explorations in the social psychology of language choice." Human Relations 14:149-164.

Hohenthal, W. D., and Thomas McCorkle.
1955 "The problem of aboriginal persistence." Southwestern journal of anthropology 11:283-300.

Hoijer, Harry.
1964 "Linguistic and cultural change." Pp. 45-462 in Dell Hymes (ed.), Language in culture and society. New York: Harper and Row.

Hymes, Dell.
1964 "General introduction." Language in culture and society. New York: Harper and Row.
1968 "The ethnography of speaking." Pp. 99-133 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Johnston, Ruth.
1963 "Factors in the assimilation of selected groups of Polish post-war immigrants in Western Australia," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Western Australia (Perth).

Jones, Robert C.
1948 "Ethnic family patterns: The Mexican family in the United States." American journal of sociology 53:450-452.

Kloss, Heinz.
1966 "German American language maintenance efforts." Pp. 206-252 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Kroeber, A. L.
1964 "Foreword." Pp. xvii-xix in Dell Hymes (ed.), Language in culture and society. New York: Harper and Row.

Kuhn, Walter.
1934 Deutsche Sprechinsel-Forschung. Plauen: Gunther Wolff.

Kuvlesky, William P., and Victoria M. Patella.
1970 "Strength of ethnic identification and intergenerational mobility aspirations among Mexican American youth." Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association meetings, Dallas, March 26-28, 1970.

Lambert, Wallace.
1955 "Development of the linguistic dominance of bilinguals." Journal of abnormal and social psychology 50:197-200.

Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Olton, R., and K. Tunstall.
1968 "A study of the roles of attitudes and motivation in second-language learning." Pp. 473-491 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Leach, Edmund R.
1965 "Culture and social cohesion: An anthropologist's view." Daedalus 94:24-38.

Obordo, Angelista S.
1968 "Status orientations toward family development: A racial comparison of adolescent girls from low-income rural areas." Unpublished Master's thesis. Texas A&M University.

Mackey, W. F.
1956 "Toward a redefinition of bilingualism." Journal of the Canadian linguistic association 2:8.

Madsen, William.
1964 The Mexican Americans of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Nall, Frank C., II.
1962 "Role expectations: A cross-cultural study." Rural sociology. 27:28-41.

Orans, Martin.
1950 "A tribe in search of a great tradition. The emulation-solidarity conflict." Man in India 30:108-114.

Parson, Talcott.
1951 The social system. New York: The Free Press.

Penalosa, Fernando.
1963 "Class consciousness and social mobility in a Mexican American community." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Southern California.
1968 "Mexican family roles." Journal of marriage and the family 30:680-689.

Ramirez, Manual.
1967 "Identification With Mexican family values and authoritarianism in Mexican Americans." The journal of social psychology 73:3-11.

Rubin, Joan.
1968 "Bilingual usage in Paraguay." Pp. 512-530 in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton.

Samora, Julian, and Wm. N. Deane.
1956 "Language usage as a possible index of acculturation." sociology and social research 40:307-311.

Schmidt-Rohr, George.
1933 Mutter sprache. Jena: Euquen Diederichs Verlag.

Skrabanek, R. L.
1969 "Language maintenance among Mexican Americans." Unpublished paper, Texas A&M University.

Speed, F. W., and W. B. Smith.
1969 "Riedwyl's goodness of fit with unknown parameters." Unpublished manuscript, Institute of Statistics, Texas A&M University.

Spencer, John.
1963 Language in Africa. (ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spilerman, Seymour.
1971 "Raising academic motivation in lower class adolescents: A convergence of two research traditions." Sociology of education 44:103-118.

Tuck, Ruth.
1946 Not with the fist. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Weinreich, Uriel.
1953 Languages in contact. New York: Linguistic circle of New York.

APPENDICES

Indicators

Mexican American Identity and Language Usage.

28. Are you of Spanish-American ancestry?
(Circle one number.)

1 Yes 2 No

---

29. a) Do you speak Spanish? (Circle one number.)

1 Yes 2 No

If you answered yes, you do speak Spanish, answer the following questions:

b) What language do you usually use when speaking with your parents? (Circle one number.)

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same of both

c) What language do you usually use when talking with your close friends in your neighborhood? (Circle one number.)

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same of both

d) What language do you usually use when speaking with your close school friends outside the class? (Circle one number.)

1 English 2 Spanish 3 About the same of both

---

30. How many of the radio programs you listen to are broadcast in Spanish?

1 None 2 Some 3 More-than-half 4 All

---

31. How many of the magazines and newspapers which you read are in Spanish?

1 None 2 Some 3 More-than half 4 All

Characteristics of Family of Orientation

32. Where were your parents born? (give the town and state.)

Mother_____

Father_____

25. Who is the major money earner in the family? (Circle one number):

1 Father

2 Mother

3 Brother or sister

4 Other (Who?_____)

5 Insurance, social security, or something like this

24. Is your father (or stepfather) presently employed outside the home? (Circle one number):

1 Yes, full-time

2 Yes, part-time

3 No, but is looking for work

4 No, does not work and is not looking for work outside the home

5 Have no father or stepfather

6 Don't know

23. Is your mother (or stepmother) presently employed outside the home? (Circle one number):

1 Yes, full-time

2 Yes, part-time

3 No, but is looking for work

4 No, does not work and is not looking for work outside the home

5 Have no mother or stepmother

6 Don't know

20. What is the marital status of your mother and father? (Circle one number):

1 Both alive, living together

2 Both alive, separated

3 Both alive, divorced

4 Father not living

5 Mother not living

6 Neither father nor mother living

22. What was the highest school grade completed by your father and mother? (Circle one number for father and one number for mother.)

Father		Mother
1	Did not go to school	1
2	Grade 1 - 7	2
3	Eighth grade	3
4	Some high school but didn't graduate	4
5	Graduated from high school	5
6	Went to Vocational School after graduating from high school	6
7	Some college but didn't graduate	7
8	College graduate (4 years)	8

9 Don't know 9

Aspirations for Future Family of Procreation

27. Listed below are a number of things that most young people look forward to. Rank them in order of their importance to you. For the one you think is most important put a number 1 in front of it; for the next most important one put a number 2; and so on until you have a different number (from 1 to 7) for each one. Read over the entire list before answering the question.

____To have lots of free time to do what I want.

____To get all the education I want.

____To earn as much money as I can.

____To get the job I want most.

____To live in the kind of place I like best.

____To have the kind of house, car, furniture, and other things like this I want.

____To get married and raise a family.

CHECK YOUR ANSWERS! You should have used each number from 1 to 7 only one time and you should have a number in each blank space.

8. (a) Do you want to get married some day?
(Circle one number):

1 Yes 2 No 3 Already married

(b) How many children do you <u>want</u>?

G-3 (a) What do you want to do about work outside the home after you are married? (Circle one number.)

(b) What do you actually expect to do about work outside the home after you are married? (Circle one number.)

<u>Want</u>		<u>Expect</u>
1	Not work outside the home at all	
2	Work part-time until I have a child	
3	Work full-time until I have a child	
4	Work part-time even after I have children	
5	Work full-time even after I have children	

<u>BOYS ONLY ANSWER THIS QUESTION</u>!

B-1 (a) If you get married, would you want your wife to work outside the home? (Circle one number.)

(b) If you get married, do you think (expect) your wife will work outside the home? (Circle one number.)

Want		Expect
1	Not work outside the home at all	1
2	Work part-time until we have a child	2
3	Work full-time until we have a child	3
4	Work part-time even after we have children	4
5	Work full-time even after we have children	5

Controls: Sex and Place of Residence

2. Sex (Circle one number: 1 Male 2 Female

4. Where have you lived most of your life?
(Circle one number):

1 City (over 2,500)

2 Town or village (under 2,500)

3 In the country, but not on a farm

4 On a farm

Frequency and Percentage Distributions of

Index on Tentative Controls

Table 20. Percentage Distribution for Index by Sex: Total Column Indicates What Percent of all R's had Each Index, and Sex Columns Indicate for Each Index, What the Sex Ratio was.*

Index	Males	Females	Total
4	27.8(1.7)	72.2(4.3)	3.1
5	30.4(2.4)	69.6(5.3)	3.9
6	42.9(3.1)	57.1(4.0)	3.6
7	30.0(1.0)	70.0(2.3)	1.7
8	44.2(6.6	55.8(8.0)	7.3
9	53.3(5.5)	46.7(4.7)	5.1
10	52.7(13.5)	47.3(11.6)	12.5
11	46.6(9.3)	53.4(10.3)	9.8
12	54.4(14.9)	45.6(12.0)	13.4
13	40.4(6.6)	59.6(9.3)	8.0
14	60.8(15.6)	39.2(9.6)	12.5
15	31.8(2.4)	68.2(5.0)	3.7
16	63.3(10.7)	36.7(6.0)	8.3
17	25.0(0.3)	75.0(1.0)	0.7
18	50.0(4.2)	50.0(4.0)	4.1
19	0.0(0.0)	0.0(0.0)	0.0
20	42.9(2.1)	57.1(2.7)	2.4
Total	49.0(100.0)	51.0(100.0)	100.0

*Parenthetical value indicates what percent of al respondents of each sex had each index.

Table 21. Frequency Distribution for Index by Border/ Non-Border Residence.

Index	Border	Non-Border	Total
4	13	5	18
5	16	7	23
6	20	1	21
7	9	1	10
8	34	9	43
9	25	5	30
10	50	24	74
11	41	17	58
12	54	25	79
13	35	12	47
14	51	23	74
15	13	9	22
16	41	8	49
17	3	1	4
18	18	6	24
19	0	0	0
20	13	1	14
Total	436	154	590

Table 22. Percentage Distribution for Index by Border/Non-Border Residence: Indicates for Each Index Value What Percentage of Those R's Were Border or Non-Border. (Total column has same content as in Table 20.) Parenthetical Value Indicates What Percentage of all Respondents Classified Border of Non-Border had Each Index.

Index	Border	Non-Border	Total
4	72.2(3.0)	27.8(3.2)	3.1
5	69.6(3.7)	30.4(4.5)	3.9
6	95.2(4.6)	4.8(0.6)	3.6
7	90.0(2.1)	10.0(0.6)	1.7
8	79.1(7.8)	20.9(5.8)	7.3
9	83.3(5.7)	16.7(3.2)	5.1
10	67.6(11.5)	32.4(15.6)	12.5
11	70.7(9.4)	29.3(11.0)	9.8
12	68.4(12.4)	31.6(16.2)	13.4
13	74.5(8.0)	25.5(7.8)	8.0
14	68.9(11.7)	31.1(14.9)	12.5
15	59.1(3.0)	40.9(5.8)	3.7
16	83.7(9.4)	16.3(5.2)	8.3
17	75.0(0.7)	25.0(0.6)	0.7
18	75.0(4.1)	25.0(3.9)	4.1
19	0.0(0.0)	0.0(0.0)	0.0
20	92.9(3.0)	7.1(0.6)	2.4
Total	73.9(100.0)	26.1(100.0)	100.0

Table 23. Frequency Distribution for Index by Location.

Index	City	Town	Country	Farm	Total
4	11	5	2	0	18
5	10	7	4	2	23
6	12	7	2	0	21
7	5	4	0	1	10
8	10	18	8	7	43
9	16	11	3	0	30
10	28	25	10	11	74
11	27	20	4	7	58
12	43	28	5	3	47
13	19	12	13	3	47
14	30	25	8	11	74
15	4	7	10	1	22
16	22	14	11	2	49
17	0	0	3	1	4
18	8	12	2	2	24
19	0	0	0	0	0
20	10	3	0	1	14
Total	255	198	85	52	590

Table 24. Percentage Distribution for Index by Location: Indicates for Each Index Value What Percentage of Those R's Were City, Town, Country, or Farm Residents. (Total column has same content as in Table 20.) Parenthetical Value Indicates What % of all Respondents Classified Either City, Town, Country, or Farm Had Each Index.

Index	City	Town	Country	Farm	Total
4	61.1(4.3)	27.8(2.5)	11.1(2.4)	0.0(0.0)	3.1
5	43.5(3.9)	30.4(3.5)	17.4(4.7)	8.7(3.8)	3.9
6	57.1(4.7)	33.3(3.5)	9.5(2.4)	0.0(0.0)	3.6
7	50.0(2.0)	40.0(2.0)	0.0(0.0)	10.0(1.9)	1.7
8	23.3(3.9)	41.9(9.1)	18.6(9.4)	16.3(13.5)	7.3
9	53.3(6.3)	36.7(5.6)	10.0(3.5)	0.0(0.0)	5.1
10	37.8(11.0)	33.8(12.6)	13.5(11.8)	14.8(21.2)	12.5
11	46.6(10.6)	34.5(10.1)	6.9(4.7)	12.1(13.5)	9.8
12	54.4(16.9)	35.4(14.1)	6.9(5.9)	12.1(5.8)	13.4
13	40.4(7.5)	25.5(6.1)	27.7(15.3)	6.4(5.8)	8.0
14	40.8(11.8)	33.8(12.6)	10.8(9.4)	14.9(21.2)	12.5
15	18.2(1.6)	31.8(3.5)	45.5(11.8)	4.5(1.9)	3.7
16	44.9(8.6)	28.6(7.1)	22.4(12.9)	4.1(3.8)	8.3
17	0.0(0.0)	0.0(0.0)	75.0(3.5)	25.0(1.9)	0.7
18	33.3(3.1)	50.0(6.1)	8.3(2.4)	8.3(3.8)	4.1
19	0.0(0.0)	0.0(0.0)	0.0(0.0)	0.0(0.0)	0.0
20	71.4(3.9)	21.4(1.5)	0.0(0.0)	7.1(1.9)	2.4
Total	43.2(100.0)	33.6(100.0)	14.4(100.0)	8.8(100.0)	100.0

Frequency Distributions of Responses to

Each of the Main Items

Table 25. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Birthplace of Parents of Mexican American Males and Females.

Responses	Both in Mexico	One in Mexico/ One in U.S.	Both in U.S.	Total*
Sex of R				
Males	34	64	191	289
Females	50	68	183	301
Total	84	132	374	590

*Small differences in totals here and in Anova tables due to the fact that Anova tables involve only R's who answered all language usage items, while these include those who did not.

Table 26. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Major Money Earner in Family of Mexican American Males and Females.

Responses	No. of Respondents		
	Father	Other	Total
Sex of R			
Males	221	47	268
Females	225	53	278
Total	446	100	546

Table 27. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Employment of the Father of Mexican American Males and Females.

Responses	No. of Respondents: Working or Looking For Work	Not Working or Looking For Work	Total
Sex of R			
Males	262	27	289
Females	285	16	301
Total	547	43	590

Table 28. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Employment of the Mother of Mexican American Males and Females.

Responses	No. of Respondents: Working or Looking for Work	Not Working or Looking for Work	Total
Sex of R			
Males	104	185	289
Females	107	194	301
Total	111	379	590

Table 29. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Marital Status of Parents of Mexican American Males and Females.

	No. of Respondents			
Responses	Living Together	Separated	Divorced	Total
Sex of R				
Male	273	6	10	289
Female	281	9	11	301
Total	554	15	21	590

Table 30. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Relative Education of Parents of Mexican American Males and Females.

	No. of Respondents			
Responses	Father's Greater Than Mother's	Equal Amounts for Both	Mother's Greater Than Father's	Total
Sex of R				
Males	78	119	92	289
Female	108	96	97	301
Total	186	215	189	590

Table 31. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Relative Importance of Family for Mexican American Males and Females.

Responses	Rank One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Total
Sex of R								
Males	6	21	26	39	41	66	87	286
Females	15	23	24	49	32	65	92	300
Total	21	44	50	88	73	131	179	586

Table 32. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Desire to Marry of Mexican American Males and Females.

Responses	No. of Respondents: Desires to Marry or is Married	Does Not Desire to Marry	Total
Sex of R			
Males	270	19	289
Females	285	16	301
Total	555	35	590

Table 33. Frequency Distibution of Responses: Desire of Mexican American Male for Wife to Work After Marriage.

	No. of Respondents					
Response	Not Work	Part-time til Child	Full-time til Child	Part-time After Child	Full-time After Child	Total
Sex of R						
Females	68	69	80	40	29	286
Total	68	69	80	40	29	286

Table 34. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Desire of Mexican American Females to Work After Marriage.

	No. of Respondents					
Responses	Not Work	Part-time til child	Full-time til child	Part-time After Child	Full-time After Child	Total
Sex of R						
Females	68	69	80	40	29	286
Total	68	69	80	40	29	286

Table 35. Frequency Distribution of Responses: Ideal Family Size of Mexican American Males and Females.

	No. of Respondents								
Respondents	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight or More	Total
Sex of R									
Male	2	42	57	70	47	30	3	14	265
Female	5	64	51	91	22	32	1	7	273
Total	7	106	108	161	69	62	4	21	538

Complete Analyses of Variance for Main Items[1]

Table 8a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Birthplace of Parents.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	M	F
Treatment	2	156.660	78.33	6.964*[2]
County	3	51.3242	17.11	1.52
Lack of Fit	6	115.775	19.30	1.72
Within	190	2137.09	11.25	
Total	201	2429.74		

Females

Treatments	2	319.265	159.6	11.90*[3]
County	3	60.9997	20.33	1.52
Lack of Fit	6	131.720	21.95	1.64
Within	169	2265.46	13.41	
Total	180	3000.44		

[1] In all Tables, the "treatments" are the response categories for the questionnaire item under consideration.

[2] This value of F is significant for .001>P>.0005.

[3] This value of F is significant for P<.0005.

Table 9a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Major Money Earner.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	1	29.8690	29.87	2.66[1]
County	3	49.3826	16.46	1.46
Lack of Fit	3	23.4981	7.833	6.97
Within	200	2247.80	11.24	
Total	207	2351.92		

Females

Treatments	1	21.7660	21.77	1.52[1]
County	3	314.825	104.9	7.30
Lack of Fit	3	13.0841	4.361	.304
Within	177	2542.78	14.37	
Total	184	2879.28		

[1]These values of F not significant for P = .10.

Table 10a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Father.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	1	57.5951	57.60	4.96*1
County	3	35.5560	11.85	1.02
Lack of Fit	3	17.5398	5.85	.503
Within	194	2252.31	11.61	
Total	201	2365.48		

Females

Treatments	1	40.2138	40.21	2.88*2
County	3	321.632	107.2	7.67
Lack of Fit	3	14.2346	47.45	.339
Within	167	2334.18	13.98	
Total	174	2721.23		

[1]This value of F is significant for .05>P>.025.

[2]This value of F is significant for .10>P>.05.

Table 11a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Employment of Mother.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	1	36.4851	36.4851	2.98 *1
County	3	41.8848	13.96	1.14
Lack of Fit	3	28.4487	9.483	.775
Within	193	2362.84	12.24	
Total	200	2473.99		

Females

Treatments	1	2.29969	2.300	.154 *2
County	3	319.809	106.6	7.13
Lack of Fit	3	16.8139	5.605	.375
Within	179	2677.00	14.96	
Total	186	3014.71		

[1]This value of F is significant for .10>P>.05.

[2]This value of F is not significant for P = .10.

Table 12a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Marital Status of Parents.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	2	57.8584	28.93	2.57 *1
County	3	35.5742	11.86	1.05
Lack of Fit	4	44.5577	11.14	.989
Within	195	2195.88	11.26	
Total	204	2342.22		

Females

Treatments	2	77.2936	38.65	2.80 *2
County	3	335.930	112.0	8.11
Lack of Fit	3	51.7921	17.26	1.25
Within	171	2361.57	13.81	
Total	179	2806.57		

[1]These values of F are significant for .10>P>.05.

Table 13a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Education of Parents.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	2	42.1921	21.10	1.87[1]
County	3	28.2860	9.429	.835
Lack of Fit	6	127.235	21.21	1.88
Within	194	2191.88	11.30	
Total	205	2392.64		

Females

Treatments	2	114.205	57.10	3.85*[2]
County	3	303.340	101.1	6.81
Lack of Fit	6	22.1459	3.691	.249
Within	179	2656.43	14.84	
Total	190	3074.84		

[1]This value of F not significant for P = .10.

[2]This value of F significant for .025>P>.01.

Table 14a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Relative Importance of Family.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	6	125.915	20.99	1.86 *1
County	3	70.6014	23.5338	2.09
Lack of Fit	17	158.385	9.317	.827
Within	190	2139.76	11.26	
Total	216	2470.88		

Females

Treatments	6	119.829	19.97	1.35 [2]
County	3	302.481	100.8	6.79
Lack of Fit	16	199.372	12.46	.840
Within	169	2507.90	14.84	
Total	194	3141.06		

[1] This value of F significant for .10>P>.05.

[2] This value of F not significant for P = .10.

Table 15a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Desire to Marry.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	1	1.76825	1.768	.161[1]
County	3	60.9435	20.31	1.85
Lack of Fit	3	67.2315	22.41	2.04
Within	278	3048.39	10.97	
Total	285	3177.88		

Females

Treatments	1	4.95005	4.950	.359[1]
County	3	293.203	97.73	7.09
Lack of Fit	3	41.7176	13.91	1.01
Within	288	3968.57	13.78	
Total	295	4303.93		

[1]These values of F are not significant for P = .10.

Table 16a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males With Respect to Desire for Wife to Work.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	4	19.1957	4.799	.427[1]
County	3	59.5231	19.84	1.77
Lack of Fit	8	57.6229	7.203	.641
Within	267	2998.60	11.23	
Total	282	3134.87		

[1]This value of F not significant for P = .10.

Table 17a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Females With Respect to Desire to Work After Marriage.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	4	177.695	44.42	3.31*[1]
County	3	175.206	58.40	4.35
Lack of Fit	12	154.451	12.87	.958
Within	263	3532.18	13.43	
Total	282	4176.61		

[1]This value of F significant for .025>P>.01.

Table 18a. Analysis of Variance for Mexican American Males and Females With Respect to Ideal Family Size.

Males

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F
Treatments	7	178.305	25.47	2.42*1
County	3	35.0383	11.68	1.11
Lack of Fit	16	252.350	15.77	1.50
Within	237	2492.34	1.052	
Total	263	2959.11		

Females

Treatments	7	204.323	29.19	2.17*2
County	3	172.159	57.39	4.27
Lack of Fit	14	12.0934	8.638	.643
Within	245	3290.88	13.43	
Total	269	3844.79		

[1]This value of F significant for .025>P>.01.

[2]This value of F significant for .05>P>.025.

VITA

NAME: Victoria Morrow Patella

DATE OF BIRTH: July 16, 1946

PLACE OF BIRTH: Boulder, Colorado

PARENTS' NAMES: Willbert John Morrow
Lucretia Wilson Morrow

PERMANENT ADDRESS: 1020 Fulbright
Redlands, California 92373

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

Pomona College, June, 1968 - B.A. in Spanish with a minor in French.

Columbia Teachers College, February, 1970 - M.A. in Education for the teaching of Spanish.

LANGUAGES: Spanish, French, Portuguese.

RECORD OF EMPLOYMENT:

February, 1969 - August, 1969 - Research Assistant Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, Texas A&M University.

The typist for this Thesis was Mrs. Ruth Ann Powell.